

SUPPLEMENTS TO
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

Formerly Philosophia Patrum

TEXTS AND STUDIES OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LIFE
AND LANGUAGE

EDITORS

J. DEN BOEFT — R. VAN DEN BROEK — A.F.J. KLIJN
G. QUISPERL — J.C.M. VAN WINDEN

VOLUME XVII



JEWISH-CHRISTIAN GOSPEL TRADITION

BY

A.F.J. KLIJN



E.J. BRILL

LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN

1992

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

ISSN 0920-623X
ISBN 90 04 09453 9

© Copyright 1992 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or
translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche
or any other means without written permission from the publisher

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal
use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that
the appropriate fees are paid directly to Copyright
Clearance Center, 27 Congress Street, SALEM MA
01970, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	VII
---------------	-----

PART ONE

1. The Evidence for Jewish Christian-Gospels

Introduction	3
Irenaeus	4
Clement of Alexandria	4
Origen	6
Didymus the Blind	8
Eusebius	8
Epiphanius	14
Jerome	16
Greek and Latin Writers after Jerome	20
<i>To Ioudaikon</i>	25
Conclusion	26

2. The Jewish-Christian Gospels

Introduction	27
Number, language, date, place of origin and names of the Jewish-Christian Gospels	27
The Contents of the Jewish-Christian Gospels	30
The History of the Jewish-Christian Gospels	32
Sources	36
Christology	39
Epilogue	41

PART TWO

Text and Commentary	47
---------------------------	----

ABBREVIATIONS	147
---------------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	148
--------------------	-----

PREFACE

Christian authors from the second century up till the fourteenth century have written about the existence of Jewish-Christian Gospels and some of them have even quoted from them. Many people have supposed that they provide information about Jesus which is not available in the canonical Gospels, but others have rejected them because of their heretical or absurd character. Gradually they fell into oblivion which meant that their contents were no longer known and the information about them became more and more unreliable.

Modern scholarship has again become interested in the contents of these apocryphal Gospels and has begun to collect the various references to them in early Christian authors. Isolated quotations have been frequently published in order to give an impression of the original text of these Jewish-Christian Gospels. The reason why early Christian authors quoted them was usually not elaborated in these studies.

Chapter I of Part One tries to fill in a gap in our knowledge of the value given to these Jewish-Christian Gospels by early Christian writers. The latter do not adopt a very critical attitude towards them but their interest in these Gospels is surprisingly great.

Chapter II of Part One goes into the number, date, place of origin, contents, sources and theology of Jewish-Christian Gospels. The results of this chapter are frequently based upon the Commentaries to the various Texts which are given in Part Two.

In the course of the preparation of this work, it became clear that many problems had to be solved. I am grateful that many friends and colleagues were prepared to help in various ways of whom we like to mention Professor Dr. B. Bischoff, Professor Dr. R. van den Broek, Dr. A. Hilhorst, Professor Dr. G. P. Luttkhuizen, Dr. G. J. Reinink, Professor Dr. J. C. M. van Winden and Professor Dr. J. Zandee †. In spite of their valuable and indispensable help a few questions still await a definitive answer. Dr. F. García Martínez and Dr. H. E. Gaylord helped me to give this work its final shape. I am extremely grateful to both.

This is the last work on Jewish-Christianity in a series of books and articles which I have written in the course of the last twenty years. It has been work based upon second-hand sources which demand a critical approach. I hope there will still be many others prepared to approach the subject in the same way and willing to continue this work.

PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE

THE EVIDENCE FOR JEWISH-CHRISTIAN GOSPELS

Introduction

Almost from the beginning of Christianity reference has been made to the existence of Jewish-Christian Gospels. None of these Gospels is known to us today. For their contents we must depend solely on quotations or purported quotations found in Christian writers. These quotations are sometimes provided in order to demonstrate the deviant views of Jewish-Christians. But often they have been assumed to provide information about Jesus unknown from other sources and, especially, from the canonical Gospels. This means that they have been approached both with a sense of abhorrence because of their heretical nature but also often with curiosity because of their supposed antiquity.¹

Some of these quotations from Jewish-Christian Gospels were extracted from the original sources but other ones were copied from even earlier writers or are of dubious origin. It is clear that various Jewish-Christian Gospels have been mixed up. Some references were held to have been taken from the original Aramaic or Hebrew Gospel of Matthew or to be at least related to that Gospel. In addition to this, mediaeval writers began to ascribe without any clear basis interesting historical information of unknown origin to a Jewish-Christian Gospel.

In this survey we have to account for these and similar possibilities. However, this chapter has not been primarily written to go into these questions, although they may come up in the discussion but to show how Christian authors have dealt with Jewish-Christian Gospels.

The oldest known authors who spoke about Jewish-Christian Gospels or used them were Papias and Hegesippus. But since their testimony is to be found

¹ See Th. Zahn, *Gesch. des neut. Kanons* II 2, 642-742; E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena* (Giessen 1905) 3-12; M.R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford 1924, 1968⁹) 1-10; E. Klostermann, *Apocrypha* II, *Evangelien* (Berlin 1929³) 4-15; A. de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios Apócrifos* (Madrid 1946) 32-57; W. Michaelis, *Die apokryphen Schriften zum Neuen Testament* (Bremen 1956, 1958², 1962³) 112-131; E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* I (Tübingen 1959³) 75-108 (P. Vielhaner); L. Moraldi, *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento* I (Torino 1971) 355-361 and 371-385; M. Erbetta, *Gli Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento, Vangeli* ... (Marietta 1975) 111-136; *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*. Pod redakcją Ks. Marka Starowieyskiego, Tom. I : *Evangelie Apokryficzne* (Lublin 1986) 67-79; W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* I (Tübingen 1987³) 114-147 (P. Vielhauer † u. G. Strecker) and also *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, ed. K. Aland (Stuttgart 1963 etc.) Index; R. McL. Wilson, *Apokryphen* II, *TRE* 111, 316-362, esp. 327-330; G. Howard, *The Gospel of the Ebionites, ANRW* 25,5 (Berlin-New York 1988) 4034-4053, and A. F. J. Klijn, *Das Hebräer- und das Nazoräerevangelium, ANRW* 25,5 (Berlin-New York 1988) 3997-4033.

in the work of Eusebius we prefer to begin with the oldest first-hand evidence given by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

Irenaeus

Irenaeus who wrote his *adversus haereses* about 190, defends a four-book Gospel "neither more nor less" (III II 8). He writes that the problem with the heretics is not that they have more Gospels or different Gospels, but that they admit only one of these four. This means that the Ebionites use only the Gospel of Matthew, Marcion the Gospel of Luke, those who distinguish between Jesus and Christ the Gospel of Mark and the Valentinians the Gospel of John (III 11 7).

He also remarks that originally each of these four Gospels was written for a particular Christian group. The Gospel of Matthew was especially intended for the "Hebrews" and was, therefore, written in the Hebrew language (III 1 1).

Apart from these general remarks Irenaeus devotes a special chapter to the Jewish-Christian sect of the Ebionites. He writes that they used one Gospel alone, that of Matthew, to the exclusion of the other three (I 26 1). Elsewhere he writes that the Ebionites had already been refuted by their own Gospel: this is an obvious reference to the story of the virgin birth in Matthew (cf. 1,23), a doctrine which was rejected by the Ebionites (III 11 7).²

Irenaeus' information is scanty and not very trustworthy. It seems that his conclusions are based upon two suppositions. In the first place he supposed that the Gospel according to Matthew was written in Hebrew for Hebrew Christians, which was a widely held idea, as we shall see,³ and in the second place he believed that all heretical sects used one Gospel only. He concluded from this that the Jewish-Christian Ebionites must have used the Gospel of Matthew.

But whatever the historical value of Irenaeus' account may be, we can say that he was apparently unacquainted with a particular Jewish-Christian Gospel. The Ebionites used the Gospel of Matthew, according to Irenaeus.

To this we can add that Tertullian, Hippolytus and Ps.-Tertullian largely depend on Irenaeus in their accounts of Jewish-Christian sects⁴ and never speak about a particular Jewish-Christian Gospel.

Clement of Alexandria

Clement also recognises a canon of four Gospels (*strom.* III 13 93, cf. *Hypotyposes*, acc. to Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* VI 14 5-7), but he also quotes from a Gospel according to the Egyptians⁵ and a Gospel according to the Hebrews.

² See Klijn-Reinink 19-20.

³ See also A. F. J. Klijn, Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian and Aramaic Gospel Tradition, *Text and Interpretation, Studies in the New Testament* presented to M. Black, edited by E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge 1979) 169-177.

⁴ See Klijn-Reinink 21-23, 107-111 and 111-125.

⁵ See Schneemelcher I⁵, 174-179 (W. Schneemelcher).

The latter arouses our interest because we assume that it was read by Jewish Christians. In *strom.* II IX 45 5, he quotes from this Gospel and in *strom.* V XIV 96 3, he gives the same passage but now without giving his source (I).⁶

The first quotation is part of a short but rather complicated passage (II IX 45) in which it is said that one virtue follows upon the other. This, however, does not apply to *σοφία* because it is divine by nature. Clement concludes that, therefore, wisdom that teaches truth is a power of God (διὸ καὶ ἡ σοφία δύναμις θεοῦ ἡ διδάξασα τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 45 2).

Next he introduces the philosopher who loves truth. This brings him to Plato, *Theaetetus* 155^b, where it is said that τὸ θαυμάσσαι, astonishment, is the beginning of philosophy. After this he immediately quotes from the *Traditions* which he ascribes to Matthias who said that one has to admire the present things "presuming that this is the first step to knowledge which lies behind it". Finally Clement writes: "As it is also written in the Gospel according to the Hebrews: 'He who has become astonished will become king and who has become king will rest'". His final conclusion is that the "unlearned man" (ἀμαθής) can never be a philosopher.

It is not necessary to go into details. We limit ourselves to the passage in which Clement speaks about "astonishment". It is supposed to be the beginning of philosophy, a well known idea at his time. He seems to choose his supporting evidence at random but the last testimony gives some additional information and together they represent various writings over a long space of time.

The second time that Clement refers to the same passage he does so without mentioning its source (XIV 96 1-3). He writes that "every good person is like (another) good person". From this he concludes that he who is like God will be a friend of all good men and also of God himself. He goes on to say that also according to Plato, *Timaeus* 90^d, understanding is the same as that which is understood and if one continues in this way, fulfillment will be reached. He ends this passage with the words: "For similar to those (ἴσοι γὰρ τούτοις) the following is possible: 'He who seeks will not cease until he finds and having found he will marvel and having marvelled he will become king and having become king he will rest'".

The words in the second passage differ slightly from those in the first one, but this discrepancy will be dealt with in the commentary.⁷ For the time being we may say that the passage must have been known to Clement's readers, since otherwise it could not have been seen to have any bearing on the subject.

From this we may draw the following conclusion. There is sufficient reason to assume that the present passage was part of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.⁸ Clement wished to quote from it, knowing that it was a witness in

⁶ I, II etc. indicates the number of the quotation in PART TWO: Text and Commentary.

⁷ See I.

⁸ O. Höfli, *Das Koptische Thomasevangelium und die Oxyrhynchus-Papyri Nr. 1, 654 und 655*, *Evangelische Theologie* 20 (1960) 21-42 and 182-192, esp. 29, rejects the idea that Clement quoted the Gospel acc. to the Hebrews because it only happened once, but this is hardly a sufficient reason for this conclusion.

defence of his case.

On the other hand we can assume that the passage was also part of a general Christian tradition. This is not only because it was quoted without introduction in the second passage, but also because it is found in other writings.⁹

From these conclusions, it is impossible to derive a clear picture of Clement's ideas about the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It happened to serve his purpose to use it in conjunction with a passage from one of Plato's writings and a work ascribed to Matthias.

Origen

Origen also is aware of a canon of four Gospels.¹⁰ In this connection he devotes a passage to Luke 1,1-2 in one of his homilies on Luke. Luke said that many have tried to write a Gospel (cf. Luke 1,1). According to Origen, some of them were inspired by the Holy Spirit, for example Matthew, Mark, John and Luke. He continues with the following words: Τὸ μέντοι ἐπιγεγραμμένον κατὰ Αἰγυπτίους εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸ ἐπιγεγραμμένον τῶν Δώδεκα εὐαγγέλιον οἱ συγγράψαντες ἐπεχείρησαν. "Ηδη δὲ ἐτόλμησε καὶ Βασιλείδης γράψαι κατὰ Βασιλείδην εὐαγγέλιον. Πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐπεχείρησαν φέρεται γὰρ καὶ τὸ κατὰ Θωμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθίαν καὶ ὅλα πλείονα."¹¹

Origen speaks of a Gospel according to the Egyptians, a Gospel of the Twelve Apostles and of a Gospel according to Basilides, Thomas, Matthias and "some more".

The Gospel according to the Egyptians is known from some quotations in Clement's *Stromateis* and is certainly not held to be Jewish-Christian.¹² The Gospel of the Twelve is sometimes identified with the Gospel of the Ebionites mentioned by Epiphanius. If this were true, the Gospel could be called Jewish-Christian, but this identification is a matter of dispute.¹³ The Gospel according to Basilides must have been named after the famous Gnostic leader.¹⁴ The Gospel according to Thomas can be identified with one of the writings discovered among the Nag Hammadi scriptures and is at least of an encratitic nature.¹⁵ Nothing is known about the Gospel according to Matthias if it is not to

⁹ See I.

¹⁰ See Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* VI 25, according to whom Origen wrote about the four canonical Gospels in his Explanation of the Psalms (1 and 3) and assumed that of the four Gospels Matthew is the oldest and must have been written in Hebrew letters (3-4).

¹¹ *Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilie des Lukas-Kommentars*, ed. M. Rauer, GCS, Origenes IX (Berlin 1959²) 4-5, cf. Hieronymus, *Comm. in Matthaeum* 1: *Praefatio* 1-10. This is also found in an interesting passage in Beda's Commentary on Luke, see p. 23.

¹² See Schneemelcher F⁵, 174-179 (W. Schneemelcher).

¹³ See p.28.

¹⁴ See Schneemelcher F⁵, 317-318 (H.C. Puech † and B. Blatz).

¹⁵ See Schneemelcher F⁵, 93-113 (B. Blatz).

be identified with the *Traditions* of the same Apostle quoted by Clement;¹⁶ nothing can be said, however, about a possible Jewish-Christian background.

Now we come to a passage in which the Gospel according to the Hebrews is quoted by Origen. In his *Commentary on John* II 12, written before 228, Origen discusses the idea that all things have been made by the Word (cf. John 1,3). This would mean that all that has been made by the Word is inferior to it. This means again that the Spirit is inferior to the Word. He continues immediately: "If somebody accepts the Gospel according to the Hebrews, where the Saviour himself says: 'A moment ago my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs and brought me to the great hill, the Thabor'(II), he will question how the Holy Spirit which is made by the Word ($\tauὸ διὰ τοῦ λόγου γεγενημένου πνεῦμα ὄγιον$) can be Mother of Christ".

Origen tries to solve this difficulty by introducing Math. 12,50, where it is said that all those who do the will of the Father are the brothers, sisters and *Mother* of Jesus. According to Origen this also applies to the divine world. This means that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews the Spirit is called Mother, because, according to Origen, she has done the will of the Father.

A second passage quotes the same words but without mentioning their source. In his *Hom. on Jer.* XV 4, written about 244, he wants to explain Jer. 15,10 which reads: "Woe to me, my mother, that you have given birth to me". Origen applies this word to Jesus but he wonders whether the word "Mother" is supposed to stand for the soul or for Mary. Drawing on Micah 7,1 (LXX): "Woe to me, my soul, because the pious one has been exterminated from the earth", he concluded that it is the soul that is spoken of. In this connection he writes: "If somebody accepts (the following): 'A moment ago my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me and brought me to the great hill, the Thabor(II) and so on', he will be able to see his Mother".

In both passages the quotation of the reference to the Gospel according to the Hebrews is remarkable, because it contradicts Origen's own conclusions. In the first passage he even uses an exegetical trick to give the quotation an acceptable meaning.

It is clear that he only deals with this quotation at all because the possibility existed that somebody "accepts"¹⁷ the Gospel or the story about Jesus' Mother. Obviously Origen knows such Christians and he is forced to take them seriously. He undoubtedly has in mind those Christians among his readers,

¹⁶ See p. 5, and Schneemelcher F, 306-309 (H.C. Puech † and B. Blatz).

¹⁷ Origen used similar expressions writing about, for example, the *Pastor Hermae*, cf. *Hornilia zum Hexateuch in Rufijs Übersetzung* II, ed. W.A. Bahrens, GCS, Origenes VII (Leipzig 1921) 51, in *Nun. Hom. VIII* 1: ...*Sed et in libello Pastoris si cui tamen scriptura illa recipienda videtur; Origenes, Matthäuserklärung* II, ed. E. Benz-E. Klostermann, GCS, Origenes XI (Leipzig 1937) 119, in *Mattheum ser. 53: ... si cui placeat etiam illum legere librum...*; Origenes, *Selecta in Psalmos, Hom. I 1 in Ps. XXXVII*, Migne, PG 12, 1372B: ...*si cui tamen libellus ille recipiendus videtur...*, and Origenes, *Homilia in Ezechielem, Hom. 13*, Migne, PG 13, 764A: *Potestis quippe legere si vultis ...*

who may have read the Gospel according to the Hebrews or who were in any event acquainted with this particular passage.¹⁸

From this we may conclude that Origen himself was not particularly impressed by this Gospel, but that he was dealing with people who know something of its contents. Does that mean that they were acquainted with the entire contents of the Gospel or only with one or more characteristic stories? The second possibility cannot be merely dismissed, because he cites this story, once with an introduction, but a second time without. We cannot exclude the possibility that the story belonged to the Egyptian tradition and happened by chance to become part of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. This would mean that the situation was not very different from that which we met in Clement's *Stromateis*.¹⁹

Didymus

Didymus is the third Egyptian writer who refers to a passage from the Gospel according to the Hebrews in an Explanation of Ps. 34,1 (LXX 33,1), written at the end of the fourth century (XIII).

The heading of the Psalm refers to king Achis to whom David had fled. This contradicts 1 Sam. 21,11-16 which speaks of king Abimelech. Didymus solves the problem by saying that many people in the Bible have two names. Moses' father-in-law is called both Jethro and Reguel, the apostle Thomas is also called Didymus, but, he continues, although Matthew is called Levi in the Gospel of Luke; it is not Matthew and Levi which are two names for the same person but *Matthias* and Levi according to the Gospel of the Hebrews.

This passage is again remarkable. For his purpose it would have been sufficient to give some examples of double names. But why would he have made it for himself difficult to introduce the Gospel according to the Hebrews using an unfamiliar and difficult identification of Matthias and Levi? The reference to this Gospel is just as unexpected here as it was with Clement and Origen. And, therefore, we again may wonder whether he spoke about this Gospel because it or in any case this passage, was known to some of his readers.

Eusebius

Eusebius is well acquainted with the idea that Matthew was originally written in Hebrew. In his *historia ecclesiastica*,²⁰ he regularly draws upon his predecessors

¹⁸ Origen never speaks of a specific Jewish-Christian Gospel, although he mentions the Ebionites several times, see Klijn-Reinink 123-125.

¹⁹ A reference to the Gospel acc. to the Hebrews in Origen's Latin translation of his Commentary on Matthew (III) will be dealt with on p. 24, because it is thought to have been added by the Latin translator.

²⁰ The History ends in the year 324 but Eusebius had already begun at the end of the third century, see R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford 1980) 10-21, and T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1981) 126-147.

in this respect. In V 8 2 he quotes Irenaeus III 1 1, in VI 25 3-4 he refers to Origen's "First Book on Matthew" and in III 39 16 he quotes a passage taken from Papias to whom we must return later. Finally in V 10 3 he tells a story about Pantaenus who went to India where he was supposed to have found the Gospel of Matthew among the local Christians. It was said to have been left to them by the Apostle Bartholomew in the Hebrew language.²¹

This means that the idea of an original Hebrew Matthew was a very commonly accepted idea in the earliest period of the Christian Church.²²

Eusebius speaks of the Gospel according to the Hebrews four times. In his *hist. eccles.* III 25 3 he writes about this Gospel in a survey of those books which had not been accepted by the Church. In III 27 4 he states that the book was used by a particular sect of Ebionites. Then he mentions that a story known to Papias was also present in the Gospel according to the Hebrews (III 39 7) and finally he relates that it was known to the Palestinian writer Hegesippus (IV 2 28). Each of these statements requires some evaluation.

Having devoted a chapter to the order of the Gospels (III 24), he thinks it necessary to give a list of the books of the New Testament (III 25). They are divided into various groups and even sub-groups. Some of them are generally accepted (ἐν δομολογουμένοις), but other ones are disputed (ἐν ἀντιλεγομένοις). Among those are the Epistles of James, Jude, 2 Peter and 2 and 3 John. To the same group belong some texts which are called spurious (ἐν νόθοις), for example the Acts of Paul, the *Pastor Hermae*, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Letter of Barnabas and the Doctrine of the Apostles. To this list of spurious but nevertheless disputed books the Apocalypse of John also belongs. This is to be understood, according to Eusebius, because this work has been accepted by some and rejected by others.²³ He immediately continues with the remark that "some" assign to this same group the Gospel according to the Hebrews which is especially used by those Hebrews who have accepted Christ (3).

²¹ In his *Demonstratio Evangelica* IX 15 6, ed. I. A. Heikel, GCS, Eusebius VI (Leipzig 1913) 436, we read: ἐνθεν εἰκότως οὐδὲ παρὰ τῷ εὐαγγελιστῇ εἴρεται Ἐβραῖον δοῦτι καὶ ἀκολούθως τῷ Ἐβραίων γραφῇ τὴν προφητείαν ἐκθεμένα, and in Eusebius, *Quæstiones Evangelicae, Questio II ad Marinum*, Migne, PG 12, 941A: ὃ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστῆς Ἐβραῖον γλώττη παρέδωκε τῷ εὐαγγέλιον.

²² See for the various Testimonies A. Resch, *Agrapha* 42-45, and A. Resch, *Ausserkanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien, Texte u. Unters.* X 1 (Leipzig 1893) 83-84, cf. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* 50-51: "Durch Irenäus und Origenes, namentlich aber durch den vielgelesenen Euseb, der in der Kirchengeschichte die älteren Nachrichten ausgeschrieben, späterhin aber auch, wie weiter unten zu zeigen, selber Gelegenheit gefunden hat, das NE (scil. Gospel acc. to the Nazoraeans) als das mathäische Original kennen zu lernen und zu citieren, ist die von Papias aufgenommenen Ansicht von der Urprünglichkeit des hebräischen Textes in der ganzen Kirche zu Herrschaft gelangt". The remark about the Gospel of the Nazoraeans and the Gospel of Matthew is a mistake because Eusebius was not aware how the Aramaic Gospel had come down to him and he never states that this Aramaic Gospel should be identified with Matthew. See the end of our discussion on Eusebius.

²³ See Grant, *o.c.*, 126-141.

This means that Eusebius assumed that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, although it may well be spurious, belongs to the category of disputed books, because some Christians were in fact reading it. Eusebius proceeded from evidence which we shall discuss presently and which will show that some Christians who, like Hegesippus, were supposed to be orthodox accepted this Gospel.

The rest of this passage deals with heretical works which are not even reckoned to be spurious ones (7) and have to be utterly rejected.

The second passage in which Eusebius refers to the Gospel according to the Hebrews deals with the Ebionites (III 27). He distinguished two groups. One of these two asserted that Christ is "a plain and common man ... born of the intercourse of a man and Mary" (2). The second group "did not deny that the Lord was born of a virgin and the Holy Spirit" (13).

This information comes from Origen who had already mentioned two different groups of Ebionites (*contra Celsum* V 61, cf. also *in Matth.* XVI 12). Origen, however, did not go into as much detail as Eusebius who seems to know exactly what the difference between the two groups is supposed to be. A closer examination has shown that the description of the group held to believe in the virgin birth has been taken from Irenaeus' account of the Ebionites. The only difference is that Eusebius remarks that they used the Gospel according to the Hebrews and Irenaeus, as we have seen earlier, that they used the Gospel of Matthew. This seems to be a correction easily explained from the point of view of Eusebius who, of course, is inclined to ascribe an apocryphal Jewish-Christian Gospel to a Jewish-Christian heretical sect.

It is not necessary to go into details because we have examined this passage elsewhere.²⁴ Nevertheless we can say that Eusebius' contribution is important because from now on the Gospel according to the Hebrews is firmly connected with the Ebionites!

Papias was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor and lived at the beginning of the second century.²⁵ He wrote five books Λογίων κυριακῶν ἔξηγήσεως. From these Eusebius quoted the following well-known passage: Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἔκαστος (III 39 16). This is the oldest known evidence for the idea that Matthew was written in Hebrew. It, therefore, has been quoted innumerable times in books on the first Gospel and in so-called Introductions to the New Testament. But up to now this passage has not been satisfactorily explained.²⁶ Three questions have to be answered. In the first place it is not clear what is meant by the words 'Ἐβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ. Does Papias really mean that Matthew

²⁴ See the discussion in Klijn-Reimink 25-26. The same is found with Theodoret of Cyr, *Comp. haer. fab.* II 1, Migne, PG 83, 388B-389A, who depends on Eusebius.

²⁵ See U. H. J. Körtner, Papias von Hierapolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums, *FRLANT* 133 (Göttingen 1983) 88-94, about the date of his life, and H. Merkel, La Pluralité des Évangiles, *Traditio Christiana* III (Bern etc. 1978) 2-3.

²⁶ The passage also speaks of the origin of the Gospel of Mark, see III 39 15.

has been written in Hebrew? If this is so, then why does the Greek text of the present Gospel of Matthew show no traces of this underlying text?²⁷ Secondly, what is the meaning of *τὰ λόγια*? Are we supposed to assume that Papias means the entire Gospel or some collection of sayings of Jesus brought together by Matthew?²⁸ And, thirdly, who was responsible for the various translations and where were these to be found?

These questions have yet to be answered although we may safely say that it is generally assumed that the passage refers to the entire Gospel. In other respects, however, most modern scholars tend to doubt the historicity of this remark.²⁹ But this does not alter the fact that it was immensely popular and influential.

Next we have to examine a passage in which Eusebius remarks that Papias knew a story about "a woman accused of many sins" (III 39 17). This story is, according to Eusebius, also present in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Two questions have to be answered: What story is meant and who is responsible for the statement about its source?

The first question will be dealt with in our commentary.³⁰ In this chapter we would like to know whether Papias is to be seen as a witness for the presence of the Gospel according to the Hebrews in Asia Minor.

Eusebius writes about the story of the woman and remarks: "as it is present in the Gospel according to the Hebrews" (*ἡν τὸ καθ' Ἐβραιοὺς εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει*). The obvious meaning of this is that Eusebius himself has added this information. There is, however, a problem in that Eusebius never displays any knowledge of this Gospel. Therefore, we have to conclude that either he happens to know of its presence in this Gospel or that he is merely guessing.

²⁷ J. Kürzinger, *Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments*, *Eichstätter Materialien* 4 (Regensburg 1983) 9-32: *Das Papiaszeugnis und die Erstgestalt des Matthäusevangelium*, esp. 23: "... nach hebräischer Darstellungsweise...".

²⁸ See for Q: S. Schulz, *Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich 1972) 13-18, who writes that Schleiermacher was the first to suppose that Papias was speaking of Q (in 1845). See also Kittel, *s.v. λόγιον*, *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T.* IV, 140-145: "Eine Berufung der modernen Theorien von einer 'Logienquelle', die eine 'Spruchquelle', dh eine Sammlung von Sprüchen Jesu wäre, auf das Papiasfragment über Matthäus hat auszuscheiden - was es im Übrigen mit diesen Theorien auf sich haben möge", see also Körtner, *a.o.*, 156-159: "Die Gattung der λόγια", and the various "Introductions to the New Testament like that of P. Feine, J. Behm, W.G. Kummel and many others. The Syriac translation of Eusebius' Church History, see W. Wright and N. McLean (Cambridge 1898) speaks of the "Gospel", but this has been certainly influenced by the general opinion in the early Church.

²⁹ See, for example, W. G. Kummel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Heidelberg 1963)¹² 26 : "Aber Papias legt ... an die Evv. falsche Maßstäbe an, und es ist daher geraten die Papiasnotizen trotz ihres hohen Alters bei der Untersuchung der literarischen Beziehung der synopt. außer Betracht zu lassen", and H. Conzelmann, *Geschichte des Urchristentums*, *Grundrisse zu N.T.* 5 (Göttingen 1969) 17: "Sie (scil. Notizen über die Entstehung der Evangelien) sind samt und sonders geschichtlich wertlos".

³⁰ See XXXVII.

The last passage in Eusebius, *hist. eccles.*, deals with the Palestinian Christian Hegesippus who lived in the second century and who wrote "five books" (IV 25 1).³¹ For our purpose it is important that Eusebius writes the following about Hegesippus' use of the Gospel tradition: ἔκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἐβραίους εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ιδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἐβραΐδος διαλέκτου τιὰ τίθησιν, ἐμφαίνων ἐξ Ἐβραίων ἐαυτὸν πεπιστευκέναι, καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὡς ἐξ Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀγράφου παραδόσεως μνημονεύει (IV 22 8).

We can split up this sentence into three parts. In the first it is stated that Hegesippus quotes from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and from an Aramaic (Gospel). Next Eusebius says that Hegesippus quoted in particular from the Hebrew language. Finally he says that Hegesippus mentioned other things from unwritten Jewish tradition.

The second and the third statement do not require much comment. They merely state that Hegesippus was held to know ancient Jewish-Christian traditions.

The first part of the passage speaks of two Gospels. The first is called "according to the Hebrews". We may assume that this Gospel is supposed to have been written in the Greek language since the second Gospel is explicitly said to have been written in Aramaic.³²

It is difficult to weigh up the historical value of this information. Yet the passage is important for the way in which Eusebius speaks of early Christian Gospel traditions. It appears that Hegesippus is a witness for very early traditions about Jesus. It is obvious that unwritten Jewish traditions, traditions in the Hebrew language and from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, are seen as giving information that is not present in the canonical Gospels. We can then say that Eusebius is the first person known to us to claim to have discovered information about Jesus in sources which were in the first place written in Hebrew and which secondly are of a period in which the Church was still dominated by its Jewish members and, therefore, by Jewish-Christian Gospels.

This conclusion seems to be corroborated by two passages in Eusebius' *Theophaneia*, in which he refers to a Gospel in Hebrew.³³ The first passage is to

³¹ See for Hegesippus: Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.* I, 385-392; Harnack, *Gesch. der altchristl. Lit.* I/2, 483-485, but also Th. Halton, s.v. Hegesippus, *TRE* XIV, 560-562 (ca. 110-180); W. Telfer, Was Hegesippus a Jew ?, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 53 (1960) 143-153, and N. Hyldahl, Hegesippus Hypomnemata, *Studia Theologica* 14 (1960) 70-113. The last two authors doubt whether Hegesippus was of Jewish origin which is the traditional view.

³² M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford 1967³) 206: "... it is clear that a Syriac Gospel was meant. It is most unlikely that this was the Harmony of Tatian... ". The last suggestion can already be found in Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.* I 388. The word Συριακός, however, means "Aramaic", cf. the *Letter of Aristeas* 9, ed. A. Pelletier, *Sourc. Chrét.* 89 (Paris 1962) 106, about Jerusalem 'Υπολαμβάνονται Συριακοὶ χρησθοῖ, see also Josephus, *ant.* X 8, ed. R. Marcus, *Loeb Class. Libr.*, Josephus VI (Cambridge, Mass. London 1958) 160: ... συριατὶ φρόζευν ήξιον.

³³ See V and VI. Eusebius speaks of the Gospel in the following way: ἐτεί δὲ τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἄκον Ἐβραϊκοῦ χαρακτήρου εὐαγγέλιον and in the Syriac version: "As we have found somewhere in the Gospel which exists among the Jews in the Hebrew language".

be found among the Greek fragments of this work and the second has been taken from the Syriac version in which the entire work has been transmitted to us. The problem is that the Greek passage does not occur in the Syriac version. This may be because Eusebius wrote a second work on the *Manifestation of Christ* which dealt exclusively with his second coming.³⁴

The passage in Greek speaks of the Parable of the Talents (cf. Matth. 25,14-30). Eusebius compares the contents of this parable to those in the Gospel "which has come to us in Hebrew letters". The differences are slight but nevertheless characteristic.

The second passage speaks about the division "of the souls which will come about in the houses", this in connection with Matth. 10,34-36/Luke 12,51-53, in which there is talk of the divisions brought about by Jesus within certain families. Eusebius remarks that the "Hebrew Gospel" gives information as to why those divisions took place. He quotes a passage in which it is stated that Jesus has chosen for himself the "good ones" whom the Father had given to him.

It is obvious that Eusebius quoted these passages because he felt that they gave additional or, at least, interesting information. Apparently he felt it worthwhile to give this information because it came from a Gospel written in Hebrew and, therefore, at an early date.

A few conclusions can be drawn from Eusebius' works. It is clear that he supposed the existence of an original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, but he had his doubts about a Gospel according to the Hebrews. This, on the one hand was used by Christians like Clement, Origen and Hegesippus, but, on the other hand, it was a Jewish-Christian Gospel and was, therefore, also, according to Eusebius, the Gospel of the sectarian Ebionites. Finally Eusebius spoke of a Gospel in Hebrew or Aramaic. A Gospel in that language had been used by Hegesippus, but Eusebius himself appears also to have come across a Gospel in Aramaic. It had no special name but it was possible to compare its contents with stories in the Gospel of Matthew, as is clear from the *Theophaneia*.

We shall see that Jerome also speaks of a Gospel in Hebrew or Aramaic as one of the books in the Library of Caesarea. It is not far-fetched to assume that Eusebius had also found this work in that Library.

In spite of the supposed relation of the Gospel according to the Hebrews to the Ebionites, both this Gospel and the Gospel in Hebrew had a certain attraction because of their antiquity and their origin within a Jewish-Christian community. It appears that upon the establishment of the four canonical Gospels the demand for additional apocryphal information became more and more acute.

³⁴ The introduction to the Greek fragments reads: Εύσεβιον or Εύσεβιον εὐαγγελικής θεοφανείας, but also Εύσεβιον δευτέρας θεοφανείας, see H. Gressmann, Studien zu Eusebius Theophanie, *Texte u. Unters.* VIII 3 (Leipzig 1903) and also Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altchristl. Lit.* III, 247.

Epiphanius

In his *Panarion*, written about 376, Epiphanius describes three Jewish-Christian sects, viz. the Cerinthians, the Nazoraeans³⁵ and the Ebionites. Of these the Cerinthians are not very interesting for our purpose because, as we shall see, they are not held to use a special Gospel.

Epiphanius is the first to speak of a Jewish-Christian sect of the Nazoraeans (ch. 29).³⁶ The information is not impressive. He obviously did not possess first-hand knowledge of this sect.

He is careful because he is aware that at one time all Christians were called by this name (29 2-3). This tradition can already be found in Eusebius³⁷ and ultimately reaches back to the Book of Acts where this name can be found.³⁸ Since Epiphanius seems to be the first writer to have come across Christians who still bore this name, he is obliged to take account of the relation between the first Christians and the sect of the Nazoraeans. On the one hand he wonders whether these Nazoraeans who lived East of the river Jordan in Beroia are the direct descendants of the Jerusalem Christians who fled to Pella, but on the other hand he suggests that they "had their beginning" in the region where they were living in his time (77-8).

With regard to their doctrine he says that "They live according to the preaching of the law ... (but) they have come to believe in Christ" (72). However, they are nevertheless cursed by the Jews three times a day.³⁹

They speak Hebrew and they read the Gospel of Matthew in the Hebrew language (94).

We have no reason to doubt that Epiphanius knew something of a Christian sect with the name Nazoraeans. Their language was Aramaic. From this we may conclude that they also read the Gospel in Aramaic. But Epiphanius causes confusion when he writes that this Gospel is the original Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. It is clear that he does not know anything of its contents.

Turning to the Ebionites (ch. 30) we have first to discuss their relation with the Cerinthians (ch. 29).⁴⁰ Epiphanius writes that the Ebionites used the Gospel according to Matthew and he continues: "For they use only this like the

³⁵ Epiphanius uses the name Ναζωραῖοι, but in both Greek and Latin writers the name is spelled in various ways.

³⁶ See Klijn-Reinink 44-52.

³⁷ See Eusebius, Περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων ... 285,3, ed. P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingen 1887) 278: Ναζωροῖ οὐ παλαιὸν ἡμεῖς οἱ νῦν χριστιανοὶ, cf. Hieronymus, *de situ et nominibus* ... 143,17-18, ed. P. de Lagarde, 75: ...sed et nos apud ueteres quasi pro obprobrio Nazaraei dicebamus, quos nunc christianos uocant. See also p. 18.

³⁸ See Acts 24,5.

³⁹ See Shemonah 'Esreh 12, cf. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ II*, rev. and ed. by G. Vermes etc. (Edinburgh 1979) 461, and also 462, n. 164.

⁴⁰ See Klijn-Reinink 3-19.

followers of Cerinthus and Merinthus⁴¹ (30 3 7). Later he even writes that the Ebionites, Cerinthians and Carpocratians used the same Gospel (30 14 2).

This seems to suggest knowledge of particular inside information but on a closer look the statement appears to have been drawn from Irenaeus. Irenaeus wrote that the Ebionites used the Gospel according to Matthew. In this connection he says that the Ebionites, Cerinthus and Carpocrates have the same ideas and he immediately continues: "They use the Gospel of Matthew only" (*adv. haer.* I 26 2). It is from this passage that Epiphanius concluded that the three sects not only had the same ideas but also the same Gospel, although with regard to the Gospel Irenaeus obviously continues to speak about the Ebionites only. Given this we can leave the Cerinthians out of further consideration.

Epiphanius' account of the Ebionites is interesting because in the chapter devoted to this sect he gives a few references to a Jewish-Christian Gospel said to have been used by the Ebionites.

First he writes that the Ebionites use a Gospel of which he says: "They call it according to the Hebrews which is correct since Matthew is the only one in the New Testament who issued the Gospel in Hebrew and with Hebrew letters" (30 3). It is obvious that Epiphanius is trying to combine various traditions. We must not forget that Irenaeus wrote that the Ebionites used the Gospel of Matthew and that Eusebius said that they used the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Epiphanius tries to explain this difference by saying that Matthew was originally written in Hebrew. Here the name "Gospel according to the Hebrews" is explained by the language in which it was written and this makes it possible to identify this Gospel with the oldest version of Matthew. However, he does not say that the Ebionites used the Gospel in the original language. And this can be understood if Epiphanius has discovered a Jewish-Christian Gospel which he ascribes to the Ebionites but which was written in Greek.

When he read this Gospel he obviously came to the conclusion that its contents differed from those of the canonical Gospel of Matthew. Therefore he had to conclude that the Ebionites had altered its text because "it is not complete but falsified and distorted" (30 13 2). On this point of view he quoted from this Gospel in order to show the differences with Matthew.

Before going into Epiphanius' argumentation with regard to this Jewish-Christian Gospel we have to say a few words about his ideas about the sect of the Ebionites.

We have seen before that Irenaeus spoke about the Ebionites, that Origen mentioned even two groups of this Jewish-Christian sect and that Eusebius combined the accounts of these earlier writers.

Epiphanius followed in their footsteps but he added fresh material to the earlier traditions known to him. This material consisted of some texts which have an obvious Jewish-Christian character.⁴² He himself had already noticed

⁴¹ The name Merinthus cannot be explained.

⁴² Epiphanius 30 15 1, ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus und Panarion, GCS, Epiphanius I* (Leipzig 1915) 352, mentions the name of the *Periodoi Petrou* and that of the *Anabathmoi Iakobou* in 30 16 7, ed. Holl 354, but also books under the names of James, Matthew, John and "other Apostles" in 30 23

that this body of material often yielded conflicting evidence. He made fairly desperate attempts to combine it all, sometimes by supposing outside influence on the Ebionites in the course of their history.⁴³ We need not go into details. We can only say that Epiphanius' account provides no basis for conclusions with regard to the origin of his so-called Gospel of the Ebionites. Epiphanius was right in saying that this Gospel was of Jewish-Christian descent but the fact that he has given it a number of names only shows that it was handed down to him anonymously.⁴⁴

From this we may draw the following conclusions. Epiphanius speaks of two Jewish-Christian Gospels, viz. that of the Nazoraeans and that of the Ebionites, the first in Aramaic and the second in Greek. However, we can see that in his view these two Gospels were originally the same Gospel of Matthew in its original language. The Gospel according to the Nazoraeans was acceptable because it did not show the Ebionite distortion. It is on this basis that Epiphanius is able to maintain the idea of the existence of a single Jewish-Christian Gospel and at the same time to reject its Ebionite redaction.

In passing we can say that Epiphanius is also the first to utterly reject the contents of a Jewish-Christian Gospel known by him to be certainly such.⁴⁵

Jerome

Jerome gives a great number of references to Jewish-Christian Gospels and often speaks of Jewish-Christians and Jewish-Christian sects.⁴⁶ However, his remarks are not consistent and show a gradual development.

We shall first give a list of his references in chronological order. This will be compared to his remarks about Jewish-Christians in general.

383 *Epist. 20 5: ... Mattheus qui euangelium hebraeo sermone conscripsit ... : ... osianna ... (XXXVIII)*

386/7 *in Eph. 5,4: ... in Hebraico ... Evangelio ... : ... laeti sitis ... (XIV)*

391 *in Micha 7,6: ... euangelio, quod secundum Hebraeos editum nuper transtulimus ... : Modo tulit ..., (II)*

392 *de vir. ill. II: ... euangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebreos et a me nuper in graecum sermonem latinumque translatum est, quo et Adamantius saepe utitur ... : ... iit ad Iacobum et apparuit ei ... (XV)*

1-2, ed. Holl 364.

⁴³ He was a strong proponent of the influence of Elzai on the Ebionites, see Klijn-Reinink 32-36.

⁴⁴ Modern scholars sometimes assume that the original name was "Gospel of the Twelve (Apostles)", see p. 28.

⁴⁵ For the sake of completeness we may add that he writes the following in his chapter about Tatian, *Panarion* 46 1 9, ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus und Panarion, GCS*, Epiphanius II (Leipzig 1922), 204, 14-205, 2: λέγεται δὲ τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (scil. Tatian) γεγενῆσθαι, ὅπερ κατὰ Ἐβραίους τωὲς καλοῦσι. This does not say more than that some people have assumed that the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Diatessaron, both supposed to have been written in Hebrew, Aramaic or Syriac, were essentially the same writings.

⁴⁶ See Klijn-Reinink 199-229.

de vir ill. III: Mattheus ... primus in Iudea propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderunt evangelium Christi hebreis litteris verbisque conposuit; quod quis postea in graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazareis qui in Veria (i.e. Beroia), urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit.

de vir. ill. XVI: in qua (scil. Letter of Ignatius to the Smyrnaeans) et de evangelio, quod nuper a me translatum est ... : ... daemonium incorporale ... (XXXIX)

398 *in Mattheum 2,5: ... in ipso Hebraico ... : ... Iudea ... (XL).*

in Mattheum 6,11: In euangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos ... : ... maar ..., cf. Tract. de Psalmo CXXXV: In hebraico evangelio secundum Matthaeum : ... crastinum .. (date unknown) (XVI)

in Mattheum 12,13: In euangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Hebionitae quod nuper in graecum de hebraeo sermone transtulimus et quod vocatur a plerisque Mathei authenticum ... : ...caementarius ... (XVII)

in Mattheum 23,25: In euangelio quo utuntur Nazareni ... : ...Barachiae ... (XVIII)

in Mattheum 27,16: ...in euangelio quod scribitur iuxta Hebraeos... : ...Barabbas... (XIX)

in Mattheum 27,51: In euangelio cuius saepe facimus mentionem ... : ... superliminare ... (XX)

408/10 *in Es. 11,1-3: ... sed iuxta euangelium quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazarei : ... fons Spiritus ...XXI)*

in Es. 40,9-11: Sed et in euangelio quod iuxta Hebraeos scriptum Nazarei lectitant ... : ...Modo me tulit ..., see Micha 7,6 (II)

in Es. prol. 65: ... iuxta euangelium, quod Hebraeorum lectitant Nazarei, incorporale daemonium ... (XXXIX)

410/5 *in Hiez. 16,13: ... in euangelio quoque quod Hebraeorum lectitant Nazarei ... : Modo me aripuit ..., see Micha 7,6 (II).*

in Hiez. 18,5-9: ... et in euangelio quod iuxta Hebraeos Nazarei legere consuerunt ... : ... spiritum contrastauerit ... (XXII)

415 *adv. Pelagianum III 2: In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidam Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumnant iuxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca ... : ... eamus et baptizemur ab eo ... (XXIII). Et in eodem volumine : ... Si peccaverit frater tuus ... (XXIV)*

In 392 Jerome quotes from the Gospel according to the Hebrews which was, according to him, "often" used by Origen (*de vir. ill. II*). Three times he refers to a passage which can also be found in Origen (*in Micha 7,6* in 391: *quod secundum Hebraeos; in Es. 40,9-11* in 408/10: *quod iuxta Hebraeos*, and *in Hiez. 16,13* in 410/5: *quod Hebraeorum lectitant Nazarei*). This raises the question whether Jerome took this quotation and possibly also other Jewish-Christian Gospel quotations from Origen's writings and whether it might be possible to

distinguish this source from other sources which might have been used by Jerome.

To this we can add some other observations. It would appear that Jerome always speaks of one single Gospel but gives it various names. We meet: *evangelium hebraeo sermone* (*epist. 20 5; in Es. 11,1-3*); *in hebraico evangelio* (*in Eph. 5,4*); *in hebraico evangelio secundum Matthaeum* (*Tract. de Psalmo CXXXV*); *quod secundum Hebraeos* (*in Micha 7,6; de vir. ill. II; in Matth. 6,11*); *quod iuxta Hebraeos* (*in Matth. 27,16; in Es. 40,9-11; adv. Pel. III 2*) and *quod Hebraeorum* (*in Hiez. 16,13*).

Secondly this Gospel was supposed to have been originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic (*epist. 20,5, de vir. ill. II and III; in Matth 12,13 and adv. Pel. II 2*).

Finally it is said that the Nazoraeans had given this Gospel to Jerome himself (*de vir. ill. III*) and that it was present in the Library of Caesarea (*adv. Pel. II 2*). Jerome is supposed to have translated it into Latin (*in Micha 7,6; de vir. ill. XVI and in Matth. 12,13*), into Greek (*de vir. ill. III*), into Greek and Latin (*de vir. ill. II*) or transcribed it (*de vir. ill. III*).

None of these statements can be made to agree with each other. It is, in the first place, certain that the Gospel which was quoted by Origen was written in Greek and not in Hebrew or Aramaic. Secondly, it has been already said more than once that the notion of an original Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew rests on fallacy.

After this provisional analysis of the introductions to the various references we shall now adopt a chronological approach to the material.

It appears that until the year 392 the Ebionites were the only Jewish-Christian sect to be mentioned by Jerome. This is corroborated by his *de situ et nominibus* written in 390, where the Nazoraeans are mentioned but nothing is said about a particular Jewish-Christian sect with this name.⁴⁷ In 392 Jerome writes about a Jewish-Christian Gospel which has come into his possession for the first time. From this we may conclude that Jerome knew of no Jewish-Christian Gospel before 392. Before this time he appears to depend entirely upon the references found in Origen's writings.⁴⁸ Origen wrote about a "Gospel according to the Hebrews" and Jerome concluded that it was originally written in Hebrew and was, therefore, the original Gospel of Matthew. He took it upon himself to translate into Greek the references from Origen and, more justifiably, to prepare a Latin version in which he presented the references to his readers as part of own writings (*de vir. ill. II*).

After 392 Jerome began to write about the sect of the Nazoraeans. He states that their Gospel was present in the Library of Caesarea and that the Nazoraeans allowed him to transcribe its text. It is impossible to say whether

⁴⁷ See n. 37.

⁴⁸ We shall return to this conclusion, but a dependence upon Origen has been generally assumed since Schmidke, *Neue Fragmente* 134-135.

this is true in every detail but we can see that he began to quote from a Gospel in Hebrew or Aramaic in his Commentary on Matthew in that year.

However, it also seems clear that Jerome did not yet possess any explicit knowledge of the Nazoraeans. In *in Matth* 12,13 he mixes up the Ebionites and the Nazoraeans. He does the same in 404 when he wrote about the Ebionites who are cursed by the Jews and adds: "Usually they are named Nazoraeans" (*Epist.* 112 13). Although there must have been some contact with the Nazoraeans from whom he received "an apocryphal book of Jeremiah" (*in Matth.* 27,9-10), the relationship must have been superficial.

From the time he wrote his Commentary on Isaiah (408/10) he began to distinguish between the Ebionites and the Nazoraeans. The Ebionites are held to be arch-heretics, no better than the Jews,⁴⁹ but the Nazoraeans are said to have accepted Christ, although they live according to the Law.⁵⁰ We can only assume that this distinction came about because Jerome chanced upon a Nazoraean Explanation of Isaiah from which he quoted copiously and which revealed to him a Christology which might be called orthodox.⁵¹

This shows that Jerome's knowledge of Jewish Christians and their Gospels was acquired gradually. His final thoughts can be found in *adv. Pel.* III 2, written in 415. The Gospel according to the Nazoraeans is still said to be "according to the Hebrews", written in Aramaic and used by the Nazoraeans. It is "as many say according to Matthew" and can be found in the Library of Caesarea.

Jerome had always been interested in the Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition because he supposed it to be related to the original text of Matthew. Initially he thought that he had discovered quotations from this Gospel in Origen. It must have been an extraordinary surprise to him to discover that a Jewish-Christian Gospel existed in Aramaic. We cannot blame Jerome for seeing the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Aramaic Gospel and the original text of the Gospel of Matthew as one and the same work. He was silent about his sources although he only owned the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans. Since he wished to show that he had also used an original Aramaic Gospel he made much of translations for which he alone would be responsible.

It is very important, especially for later authors, that he assumed that his Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition could be a source of information about traditions about Jesus which were not known from the canonical Gospels.

⁴⁹ See *in Es.* 66,20 (408/10), Klijn-Reinink 226, and *in Hiez.* 44,6-8 (410/15), Klijn-Reinink 226.

⁵⁰ See *in Es.* 8,11-15, Klijn-Reinink 220, and 19-22, 220-221; 11,1-3, 222 and 19, 17-21, 222 (408/10).

⁵¹ See A. F. J. Klijn, Jerome's Quotations from a Nazoraean Interpretation of Isaiah, *Judéo-Christianisme. Recherches historiques et théologiques offertes en hommage au Cardinal J. Daniélou*, *Rech. de Science Religieuse* 60 (1972), 241-255, and R.A. Pritz, Nazarene Jewish Christianity, *Studia Post-Biblica* 37 (Leiden 1988) 57-70.

Greek and Latin Writers after Jerome

The Greek⁵² and Latin writers of this period can be dealt with together because they usually depend on earlier sources, and upon Jerome in particular. We all have to answer the important question of whether they had any personal knowledge of one or more of the Jewish-Christian Gospels. This cannot, however, be the subject of this chapter in which our primary aim is to discover how these Gospels were evaluated.

The number of references to Jewish-Christian Gospels after Jerome is rather small. The reason for this lack of interest is that gradually Jewish-Christians sects came to be regarded as heretical and as movements, therefore, to be condemned with their writings.

Augustine speaks in his *de baptismo* VII 1, written ca. 400, of those who call themselves *christianos Nazarenos* who circumcise themselves and are "born heretics".⁵³ Several times he condemns the Nazoraeans along with the Symmachians because of their Jewish life-styles.⁵⁴ The "heresy of Ebion" is no better than that of "those who are usually called Nazoraeans".⁵⁵ In his *de haeresibus* he is obviously depending upon Epiphanius when he writes that the Nazoraeans "confess that the Son of God is Christ" but that they nevertheless observe everything of the old Law, and that the Ebionites say that "Christ is only a man" and that "they observe the carnal mandates of the Law".⁵⁶

It is useful to quote from Augustine's writings because they are in their turn the source for many anti-heretical writers from Praedestinatus in about 435 until Paulus in the 11/12th century.⁵⁷

It is striking that in the refutations of Jewish-Christian sects there is seldom talk of their Gospels. We find something about the Gospel according to the Hebrews in connection with the Ebionites in Theodore of Cyr's *Compendium hereticorum fabulorum* II 1, written in ca. 453,⁵⁸ and in Nicephorus Callistus' *Ecclesiasticae Historiae* III 13, written in the 13/14th century, but both

⁵² The references in some manuscripts of the the New Testament to *To Ioudaikon* will be dealt with in a separate chapter.

⁵³ Klijn-Reinink 236, also Eugypus Abbas Africanus, *Thesaurus* CCXXVI, Migne, *PL* 62, 888B (2nd half 5th cent.), Klijn-Reinink 252.

⁵⁴ *Contra Faustum* XIX 4 and 17, and *contra Cresconium* I 31 38, see Klijn-Reinink 236 and 238.

⁵⁵ *Epist.* CXVI 16 1, Klijn-Reinink 238.

⁵⁶ *De haer.* 9 and 10, Klijn-Reinink 238-239.

⁵⁷ Praedestinatus, *Corp. Haer.* I 9 and 10 (ca. 435), Klijn-Reinink 242-244; Isidorus of Seville, *De Haer. Libri* X and XI (625/635), Klijn-Reinink 260; John Damascene, *De Haer.* 29-30 (ca. 745), Klijn-Reinink 264; Theodore bar-Khonai, *Lib. Scholiorum*, Part II, 301 and 302 (791/2), Klijn-Reinink 266; Honorius Augustodunensis, *De Haer. Libell.* XXIV and LII (12th cent.), Klijn-Reinink 272, and Paulus, *De Haer. Libell.* IV and V (11/12th cent.), Klijn-Reinink 274.

⁵⁸ Klijn-Reinink 246. It is striking that in II 2, Klijn-Reinink 248, it is said that the Nazoraeans used the Gospel of Peter. This seems to be a misunderstanding which can be explained from a passage in Origen, see Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* 119-120.

authors draw upon Eusebius' passage about the Ebionites in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.⁵⁹

This situation does not favour the preservation of the text of Jewish-Christian Gospels. Nevertheless a number of references exist in Christian authors after Jerome. It is striking that the great majority is found in authors writing in Latin.

We shall first examine a group of references which clearly depend on Jerome's writings. Since we are especially interested in the value attested to Jewish-Christian Gospels we shall pay particular attention to the introductions to the various quotations.

On this basis they can be divided into three groups. The first group has the same introduction as in the text of Jerome. In the second group the name of the source has been omitted and in the third the name of the source has been changed. The following survey can give us some indication of the significance attached to the various sources originally mentioned by Jerome.

A. Quotations which mention the same source found with Jerome:

Jerome,

<i>de vir. ill.</i> II (XV)	Irish Reference Bible, ca. 800
<i>in Matth.</i> 2,5 (XL)	Sedulius Scottus, 10th cent.
<i>in Matth.</i> 6,11 (XVI)	Paschasius Radbertus, 9th cent.
<i>in Matth.</i> 12,13 (XVII)	Sedulius Scottus, 9th cent.
<i>epist.</i> 20 5 (XXXVIII)	Sedulius Scottus, 9th cent.
	Rabanus Maurus, 9th cent.
	Paschasius Radbertus, 9th cent.
	Paschasius Radbertus, 9th cent.

B. Quotations which unlike Jerome fail to name the source:

<i>de vir. ill.</i> II (XV)	Pseudo Abdias, 6th cent.
<i>in Matth.</i> 12,13 (XVII)	Gregory of Tours, 6th cent.
<i>in Matth.</i> 23,35 (XVIII)	Zacharias Chrysopolitanus, 12th cent.
<i>in Matth.</i> 27,16 XIX)	Paschasius Radbertus, 9th cent.
	Paschasius Radbertus, 9th cent.

C. Quotations which alter the name given by Jerome:

<i>de vir. ill.</i> II (XV)	Jacob de Voragine, 12th cent.: Josephus and Jerome
<i>in Matth.</i> 12,13 (XVII)	Paschasius Radbertus, 9th cent.: <i>in Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni</i>
<i>in Matth.</i> 23,35 (XVIII)	Petrus Comestor, 12th cent.: <i>in</i> <i>Evangelio Nazaraeorum</i>
<i>in Matth.</i> 27,16 (XIX)	Zacharias Chrysopolitanus, 12th cent.: <i>in Evangelio Hebraico</i>

⁵⁹ Klijn-Reinink 276.

in Matth. 27,51 (XX)

Christian of Stavelot, 9th cent.:
 Josephus
 Petrus Comestor, 9th cent.: *in Evangelio Nazareorum*
Hist. Passionis Dom., 14th cent.:
in Evangelio Nazareorum
 Hugo of St. Cher, 13th cent. :
evangelium Nazaraeorum
in Es. 11,1-3 (XXI)
 Hugo of St. Cher, 13th cent. :
evangelium Nazaraeorum

We may conclude that Jerome was showing off his knowledge of early Jewish-Christian and Aramaic sources. We can not say that the same is true for Latin writers of a later period. Some of them give the same information but they omit to mention its source. This may be because they felt it to be heretical (see especially group B). Nevertheless, we see that sometimes the source has indeed been given but here we should remember that group A consists almost entirely of references to Hebrew witnesses or to the supposed Hebrew text of Matthew (cf. *in Matth. 2,5*; *in Matth. 6,11* and *in Matth. 12,13*). It appears that this source was still respectable until a late date. Zacharias Chrysopolitanus changed the original source into *in Evangelio Hebraico* (group C).

However, some writers still prefer to quote from Jewish-Christian Gospels. References can be found in: Irish Reference Bible, Sedulius Scottus, Petrus Comestor, *Historia Passionis Domini* and Hugo of St. Cher. Paschasius Radbertus generally avoids speaking of his source which but once he mentions a "Gospel which is used by the Nazoraeans" (*in Matth. 12,13*). In his *expositio in evang. Matthei II 2*, he speaks of "some heretics" called the Nazoraeans who *Evangelium invenerunt quod Nazarenorum proprie nominatur*.⁶⁰

All this does not mean that Jewish-Christian Gospels have been totally rejected. This can be shown by the following list of references to Jewish-Christian Gospels which does not depend upon Jerome. It is striking that some of them refer to the Gospel according to the Hebrews and other ones to the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans.

Gospel according to the Hebrews:

Sedulius Scottus, 9th cent., three kings (XLI)
 Gospel of Maelbrigte, 9th cent., three kings (XLI)
Cod. Vat. Reg., 9th cent., *VII dies pascae* (XLIII)
Hist. inv. ev. sec. Lucam, 9th cent., *Bezaida* (XLIV)
 Seventeen Miracles during Jesus' Birth (LVI)

Gospel according to the Nazoraeans:

Haimo of Auxerre, 9th cent., *multa milia Judeorum* (XLII)
Hist. Pass. Dom., 14th cent., *multa milia Judeorum* (XLII)
 Hugo of St. Cher, 13th cent., *multa milia Judeorum* (XLII)

⁶⁰ Klijn-Reinink 268.

Petrus de Riga, 12th cent., *oculi radii* (XLVI)

Hist. Pass. Dom., 14th cent., *osculatus* (LII)

Luke 22 (LIII)

John 18 (LIV)

flagellandum (LV)

Hugo of St.Cher, 13th cent., *in Matth.* 1,35, *faciem* (XLVII)

27,53, *sancti viri* (XLVIII)

27,57, Joseph (XLIX)

in Joh. 19,43, Joseph (XLIX)

in I Cor. 15,5, *apparuit beatae virgine* (L)

It is improbable that any of these references were taken directly from Jewish-Christian Gospels. However, they are interesting as an indication of how these Gospels were regarded.

The list shows that the various writers and writings can be divided into those who speak of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and those who speak of the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans. At the same time we see that the English and Irish sources use the title "according to the Hebrews" and the continental ones the title "according to the Nazoraeans".⁶¹

We have here two different branches of the Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition. The tradition of England and Ireland is represented by Beda Venerabilis. After relating the famous passage about the various apocryphal Gospels which is found in Origen and Jerome,⁶² he continues: *Inter quae notandum quod dicitur evangelium iuxta Hebraeos non inter apocriphas sed inter ecclesiasticas numerandum historias. Nam et ipsi sacrae scripturae interpreti Hieronymus pleraque ex eo testimonia usurpare et ipsum in Latinum Graecumque uisum est transferre sermones.*⁶³

The continent is represented by two writers each of whom maintains the identity between the name of the early Christians (cf. Acts 24,5) and that of the Jewish-Christian Gospel. Petrus Comestor writes in the 12th century: *Primi itaque discipuli Christi Nazarei dicebantur, qui Evangelium scripserunt, sed Ecclesia quatuor tantum recipi. Cumque ita primo vocarentur Nazarei, postea vocati sunt sequentes Christum discipuli, postea instituente Petro, a Christo, Christiani*,⁶⁴ and Hugo of St.Cher: *Fuerunt autem illi Nazarei, illi primi fideles, ad opus quorum fecerunt apostoli collectas in Jerusalem, quibus erat cor unum et anima una* (Acts 4,32), *qui de gestis domini evangelium scripserunt, verissimum, sed propter sacramentum nostrum non receptum cum aliis.*⁶⁵

⁶¹ Herr Professor B. Bischoff wrote to me (November 5th 1988) with regard to *Hist. Pass. Dom.*: "Nach den ganz wenigen eingestreuten deutschen Wörtern ... muss ich an oberdeutsche Herkunft denken".

⁶² See p. 6.

⁶³ Beda Venerabilis, *Opera*, Pars II: *Opera Exegetica 3, In Lucae Evangelium Expositio ad 1,1-4*, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL CXX (Turnholti 1960) 19-20.

⁶⁴ Petrus Comestor, *Historia Scholastica in Evangelia*, cap. CXXXV, Migne, PL 198, 1609A.

⁶⁵ Hugo of St.Cher, *in librum Isaiae*, tom. IV (Venetiis 1732) 30a.

This shows that even after Jerome Latin writers were still interested in Jewish-Christian Gospels, because they held them to be ancient sources of information about the Life of Jesus.

The group of Latin writers after Jerome may also be taken to include the unknown translator of Origen's Commentary on Matthew, who is assumed to have lived some time between the fifth and the ninth centuries.⁶⁶ It is also commonly assumed that he is responsible for inserting into the commentary the passage in which the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" is quoted.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, we shall see that the reference itself may be an authentic passage which has been taken from a Jewish-Christian Gospel. This was probably not that of the Hebrews but that of the Nazoraeans.⁶⁸ Here, however, we shall examine why this quotation was added to the text of Origen in the Latin translation.

In his commentary on Matthew XV 14 Origen deals with the story of the Rich Young Man (Math. 19,16-22). He is of the opinion that the remark about "loving one's neighbour as oneself" in Matth. 19,19 does not fit into the context of the story. He assumed that it was added to the text, especially because the same words are also omitted in the parallel passages of Math. 10,19 and Luke 18,20.

In this connection he tells his readers that something similar exists in the Septuagint which also sometimes differs from the Hebrew text. In such cases it was Origen's practice to obelise words in the Greek version that were not found in the Hebrew text and he put between asterisks words that were added from the Hebrew text because they were missing in the Greek. Immediately he adds that in this way everyone who so wishes can reject such passages and whoever wishes to preserve them can do so. The same can be done in Origen's view with the passage in Matthew. He does not wish to argue with those who reject these words but for those who wish to keep them he will give an interpretation.

The Latin translation gives a faithful rendering of the passage up till Origen's remark about the Greek version, but the translator omits the words about the possibility of rejecting or accepting the passage under consideration. On the contrary the Latin text emphatically states that the same can *not* be done with the New Testament. The translator returns to the words about loving one's neighbour and begins to quote the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It appears that in this Gospel the instruction to love one's neighbour is present.

The meaning of the Latin text is perfectly clear. It is obviously a correction of the original Greek text. The translator did not like the superficial way in which the Greek text implied that a passage in the New Testament might be omitted. He thus referred to the Gospel according to the Hebrews to show that the injunction was also present in this document. This can only mean that the

⁶⁶ See J. Quasten, *Patrology* II (Utrecht/Antwerp 1953) 48

⁶⁷ See Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* 90-94, and Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 335-336.

⁶⁸ See p. 31.

Latin translator attached some importance to this Gospel. It may be because it was a Gospel according to the Hebrews and could, therefore, be held to reflect the original Hebrew version of Matthew. But, whatever his motivation, we have again a case in which a Jewish-Christian Gospel is used as a welcome aid to solve difficult exegetical questions.

To Ioudaikon

Five manuscripts containing Gospel Texts which were written between the 9th and the 13th centuries contain altogether 13 marginal references to *To Ioudaikon*. The marginalia apply to words, phrases or to whole passages.

We shall examine the numerous problems raised by these references elsewhere but we can already say that there are several reasons for assuming that what is referred to is a Jewish-Christian Gospel. In the first place this can be concluded from the name. Next it appears that the Greek references have been translated from a Semitic original and finally that one of the references seems to agree with a passage mentioned by Jerome which was taken from the Gospel according to the Nazoreans (XXIV).

We shall first look at the question of why the marginal notes were added. We can divide them into the following groups:

- A. Information about an existing textual difficulty: *ad Matth.* 5,22 (XXVI) and 16,2-3 (XXXIII).
- B. Alternative readings: *ad Matth.* 4,5 (XXV); 10,16 (XXVIII); 11,12 (XXIX); 11,25 (XXX); 12,40 (XXXII); 16,17 (XXXIV) and 26,74 (XXXV).
- C. Additions of some length: *ad Matth.* 7,5 (XXVII); 18,22 = Jerome, *adv. Pel.* III 2 (XXIV) and 27,65 (XXXVI).

References to Jewish-Christian Gospels like these are not unknown. Some of them can be compared with those in Jerome's Commentary on Matthew. It is, therefore, not impossible that the references were taken from a commentary on the Gospel of Matthew because the occasional notes show no systematic comparison of a Jewish-Christian Gospel with the Gospel of Matthew.⁶⁹

Since elsewhere we shall discuss a number of other questions regarding these references (such as to their source and original language) we can conclude that the use of these marginal notes fits into a pattern which we have encountered in other writers. They are meant to clarify a particular passage or word or to give some interesting addition to the text.

⁶⁹ See for references to variant readings in the New Testament B.M. Metzger, *Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts, Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of R.P. Casey*, edited by J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson (Freiburg im Br. 1963) 78-95.

Conclusion

We must conclude our survey of the way in which Jewish-Christian Gospels were used and regarded in early and later Christian authors and writings.

We note that in the early period knowledge of these Gospels was obviously so widespread in some regions that it was impossible for non-Jewish-Christian writers to ignore their existence. This was the situation in Egypt and is reflected in the works of Clement, Origen and even Didymus the Blind. However, Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition gradually fell into oblivion in this region.

A second reason for the interest in Jewish-Christian Gospels was the generally accepted idea that the canonical Gospel of Matthew was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic and that this Gospel had its roots in an ancient Jewish-Christian, Hebrew speaking community. Knowledge of the existence of a Gospel in Hebrew or Aramaic, as in the cases of Eusebius and Jerome, increased such interest.

Eusebius writes that Hegesippus and Papias had already searched for ancient Aramaic oral traditions to supplement the traditions available in the canonical Gospels.⁷⁰ This historical interest returns with Eusebius and Jerome, the latter of whom often tried to solve exegetical problems by recourse to Jewish-Christian sources. Jerome in his turn influenced his mediaeval successors, especially in Ireland.⁷¹ We can wonder whether they always showed sufficient critical insight. On the other hand, we may state that Epiphanius who himself discovered a Jewish-Christian Gospel was very disappointed in its contents and decided to reject it altogether.

But as a general conclusion it is fair to say that Christian authors from the earliest period and even up to the present day⁷² have assumed that Jewish-Christian Gospel traditions can provide information about Jesus and the Apostolic Church. However, for this very reason it is necessary to take a critical approach to whatever information has been provided to us down the years.

⁷⁰ See Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* III 39 3 and IV 22 8-9.

⁷¹ See M. McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin 1973).

⁷² G. Quispel in particular has succeeded in discovering an extra-canonical Gospel tradition in Jewish-Christian and early Christian sources.

CHAPTER TWO

THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN GOSPELS

Introduction

In spite of the many references to Jewish-Christian Gospels in ancient and mediaeval literature much remains unclear with regard to, for example, their number, the names by which they were originally known and the language in which they were written. Many Christian writers quoted from these Gospels even though they had never seen any of them. This has been the cause of errors, misunderstandings and unjustified ideas about their contents now and in the past. This also means that we have to go into some critical questions.

Latin sources after Jerome, apart from the Latin translation of Origen's *Commentary on Matthew*, will be dealt with separately.

Number, language, date, place of origin and names of the Jewish-Christian Gospels

Before anything can be said about the various references to Jewish-Christian Gospels, we have to know the Gospel to which they belonged and the language in which it was written. It appears that Jerome and the authors after him supposed that only one Jewish-Christian Gospel existed, that this had originally been written in Aramaic and that it must have gone back to the original Hebrew text of the Gospel of Matthew. This view would have been stimulated by the knowledge that a Jewish-Christian Gospel in Aramaic existed; by the tradition about a Jewish-Christian sect of the Nazoraeans that bore the same name as the early Christians in Jerusalem and by the awareness of a Gospel said to be "according to the Hebrews" that was quoted by Clement and Origen. Even Epiphanius, who discovered a Jewish-Christian Gospel which widely differed from the Gospel of Matthew, did his best to show the difference between this Gospel and that of Matthew in order to demonstrate that the Jewish-Christians had falsified its text.

However, we have to reckon with at least two different Gospels because we meet two different versions of the Baptism of Jesus, one referred to by Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 13 7-8 (IX) and another one by Jerome, *in Es.* 11,1-3 (XXI). At present it is generally assumed that Epiphanius quoted from a Gospel that was known to him only. It has its own particularly theological character but it is also of a typically harmonistic kind. This second element is absent from quotations found in other authors.⁷³

⁷³ A. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* 424, and A. Schmidtke, *Hebräerevangelium*, *ZNW* (1936) 24-44, esp. 36, has always defended the identity of the Gospel acc. to the Ebionites, quoted by Epiphanius, with the Gospel acc. to the Nazoraeans, especially against H. Watz, *Das Evangelium*

We intend first to discuss the Gospel used by Epiphanius. Its original language must have been Greek, because its numerous parallels with the canonical Gospels can only be explained if we assume that the author of this work used a Greek text of the New Testament.

Epiphanius writes about the name of this Gospel: "The Gospel which is called with them according to Matthew which is not complete but falsified and distorted, they call (it) the Hebrew Gospel ... " (*Panarion* 30 13 2). This remark repeats the traditional view of a Jewish-Christian Gospel and should, therefore, not be taken at face value. It is for this reason that another name has been proposed, taken from the contents of one of the references which reads (VI): "There was a man called Jesus ... who chose us" and "(Jesus) opened his mouth and said: '... I chose John and James, the son of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew and Thadaeus and Simon the Zealot and Judas Iscariot and you Matthew ... '".

At the beginning of this quotation there is mention of *us*, viz. the twelve apostles, who also seem to be responsible for the contents of this Gospel. This would mean that the Gospel could be called "Gospel of the Twelve", which is the name of a Gospel mentioned in a passage in Origen.⁷⁴ On the other hand, however, it is clear that at the end of the quotation it is Matthew who is being addressed in particular. This means that the name "Gospel according to Matthew" can also be defended.⁷⁵ This last name cannot be easily dismissed because it can explain why Epiphanius wrote "The Gospel which is called with them according to Matthew" and why he was so indignant about its contents.

If the title of this work had been "Gospel of the Twelve", the place of origin could have been Egypt because this name is known to Origen only. However, the relation of this work to the contents of the *Periodoi Petrou* and *Anabathmoi Iakobou*⁷⁶ seems to show that the work belongs to the region east of the river Jordan.

der Zwölf Apostel (Ebionitenevangelium), *ZNW* 13 (1912) 338-348 and 14 (1913) 38-64 and 117-132, see esp. 14 (1913) 40ff, and H. Waitz, *Neue Untersuchungen über die sogen. judenchristlichen Evangelien*, *ZNW* 16 (1937) 60-81.

⁷⁴ See p. 6.

⁷⁵ Those in favour of the name "Gospel according to the Twelve (Apostles)" are R. Handmann, *Das Hebräer-Evangelium, Texte u. Unters.* V 3 (Leipzig 1888) 45 and 110ff; Zahn, *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons* II/2, 724-745; Harnack, *Gesch. der altchristl. Lit.* I/I 205-206; A. Meyer, *Ebionitenevangelium (Evangelium der 12 Apostel)*, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, herausgeg. v. E. Hennecke (Tübingen 1904) 43-47; Waitz, *Das Evangelium der Zwölf Apostel*; Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 170; A. de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios Apócrifos* (Madrid 1946) 51-57; cf. O. Cullmann, *Ebionitenevangelium, Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* II (Tübingen 1958³) 298: "Aus den zwölf Apostel, die zu Beginn des E.s gesamthaft als Erzähler der Geschichte Jesu erscheinen, ragt als eigentlicher Gewährsmann *Matthäus* hervor". The idea has been rejected by A. Schmidtko, *Neue Fragmente* 170-175 and 242 and *Zum Hebräer-Evangelium* ... 32, but see also M. D. A. Bertrand, *L'Évangile des Ébionites: une Harmonie évangélique antérieure au Diatessaron*, *NTS* 26 (1980) 548-563, esp. 561.

⁷⁶ See p. 15 and Klijn-Reinink 31.

The date of the work is difficult to establish. It seems to have been composed with help of the three synoptic Gospels but without John.⁷⁷ Because the three synoptic Gospels appear to have been known by the composer, a date before 100 is impossible, but since John has not been used, a date after 150 seems to be out of the question.

Now we shall look at references outside Epiphanius' works. The problems are complicated, since Jerome mixed up various sources as we have seen. He obviously borrowed some references from Crigen but he also was acquainted with a Gospel which he received from the Nazoraeans. This "Gospel according to the Nazoraeans" which was quoted by Jerome under various names was written in Aramaic. On the other hand we have reasons to assume that Clement and Origen did not quote from an Aramaic Gospel or even from a Gospel which had been translated from that language. We, therefore, come to the conclusion that we are dealing with two Gospels, viz. one in Greek and one in Aramaic. This agrees both with Hegesippus who, according to Eusebius, used the Gospel according to the Hebrews and an Aramaic Gospel,⁷⁸ and with Eusebius himself who referred to the Gospel according to the Hebrews in his *historia ecclesiastica*⁷⁹ and quoted from a Gospel in "Hebrew characters" in his *Theophaneia*.⁸⁰

The reason to suppose that these witnesses are speaking about the same Aramaic Gospel is that they can all be located in the same area. Eusebius lived in Caesarea, Hegesippus in Palestine and the Nazoraeans have to be situated in the neighbourhood of Beroia.

There is sufficient reason to assume that the Gospel in Aramaic was written by the Nazoraeans, a Jewish-Christian sect whose members spoke Aramaic, according to Epiphanius.⁸¹ It is referred to as the Gospel in Hebrew

⁷⁷ See Zahn, *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons* II/2,733: "Vorstehende Übersicht beweist, dass dieses Ev. eine sehr künstliche Compilation war, zu welcher die kanonischen Evv. weitaus das Meiste beigetragen haben ... Darüber ob Jo. Beiträge hat liefern müssen ergeben die wenigen Fragmente keine völlige Sicherheit"; Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 169: "Zahn hésite quant à des emprunts à Jo., mais il lui paraît certain que l'évangile s'est servi de Mc. Cela est d'autant moins probable que tout s'explique suffisamment par des réminiscences de Lc. et de Mt.>"; Bertrand, *art.cit.*, 563: "L'EE considère les trois synoptiques"; M.-É Boismard, *Évangile des Ébionites et le Problème synoptique* (Mc 1,2-6 et par.), *Rev. Bibl.* 63 (1966) 321-252, supposes that the Gospel is a representative of a Gospel text which is a very complicated development of the "tradition primitive" into the direction of an "Mc-primitif" and a Hebrew Matthew. We draw attention to the well-balanced article written by G. Howard, *The Gospel of the Ebionites*, *ANRW* 25,2 (Berlin-New York 1988) 4034-4053. Finally F. Neirynck, *The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark*, J.-M. Sevrin, *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, *Bibl. Ephem. Theol. Lov.* LXXXVI (Leuven 1989) 123-175, esp. 157-160, again goes into the question of the presence of Mark with the conclusion "The dependence on Matthew ... can be combined with dependence on Mark".

⁷⁸ See p. 11-12.

⁷⁹ See p. 9-10.

⁸⁰ See p. 12-13.

⁸¹ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 29 9 4, ed. Holl 332.

letters or as the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans which seems to demonstrate that the Gospel did not possess a special name.

Its date is difficult to establish because this more or less depends on the sources from which the Gospel was composed. As we shall see, it seems that the author of this work knew of no other Gospel than that of Matthew or one of its sources. Since the Gospel was probably known to Hegesippus we would suggest a date of origin between 100 and 150.

This leaves us with the third Gospel, viz. that according to the Hebrews, as it is called by Clement, Origen and Didymus. We assume that this is the same Gospel said to have been known to Hegesippus. We must assume that this Gospel was written in Egypt. It was obviously named after those who used the work but we doubt whether this was its official title and must assume that this Gospel too was originally published without a name.

The author used ancient Christian traditions which seems to indicate an early date of origin. Because it was already known to Clement we can suggest a date about the year 150.

Our conclusion is that from the various references in Christian authors three Jewish-Christian Gospels can be traced. They belong to three individual Jewish-Christian circles. One group lived East of the river Jordan and may be related to those responsible for traditions present in the Pseudo-Clementines. A second was used by Jewish-Christians living in the neighbourhood of Beroia who were commonly called Nazoraeans. The third was used by Egyptian Christians of Jewish descent.⁸²

The Contents of the Jewish-Christian Gospels

We came to the conclusion that the Gospel according to the Ebionites was known to Epiphanius only. He gives the following quotations from this Gospel:

- I have chosen John (VI)
- wild honey (VII)
- in the days of Herod (VIII)
- baptism of Jesus (IX)
- who is my mother (X)
- abolishment of sacrifices (XI)
- eating of meat (XII).

⁸² Among the modern editions of the Apocryphal Gospels De Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios Apócrifos* 32-53; Moraldi, *Apocrifi I* 355-361 and 371-385; Erbetta, *Gli Apocrifi...*, *Vangeli* 114-136 and *Apokryfy Nowego Testamento...* 67-79, still distinguish between two Jewish-Christian Gospels. However, those who accept three Gospels are not always unanimous about the question as to which references have to be attributed to each individual Gospel. B. M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford 1987) 169-170, seems to assume that only one Jewish-Christian Gospel existed, viz. the Gospel according to the Hebrews, translated into Greek and Latin by Jerome, of which we have today several quotations made by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome and Cyril of Jerusalem.

The quotations in Clement, Origen and Didymus have been taken from the Egyptian Gospel according to the Hebrews. We may, however, assume that Jerome gave some other quotations which he took from Origen or from some other writer unknown to us who also quoted from this Gospel. We already know that Jerome three times gave a quotation about the mother of Jesus (II) which he took from Origen. We also came to the conclusion that Jerome could not have known the Gospel according to the Nazoreans before 392 which means that references in writings before that date could also have been taken from Origen.⁸³ This conclusion has been corroborated by the introductions to these passages in which nothing is said about a Gospel of the "Nazoreans". This brings us to the following passages that apparently belong to the Gospel according to the Hebrews:

- Clement, οὐ παύσεται (I)
- Origen and Jerome, Ἀρτι ἔλαβε (II)
- Didymus the Blind, Levi/Matthias (XIII)
- Jerome, *nunquam laeti sitis* (XIV)
- Jacobus* (XV)
- in omnibus prophétis* (XXI)
- fratris sui spiritus contristaverit* (XXII).⁸⁴

Finally we must consider the contents of the Gospel according to the Nazoreans. We start from the assumption that all quotations in Jerome that do not belong to the Gospel according to the Hebrews were taken from the Gospel according to the Nazoreans. However, a few doubtful references remain. In the commentary it will become clear that the quotations in *de viris illustribus* XVI (XXXIX), in *épistula* 20 5 (XXXVIII) and in *Matthaeum* 2,5 (XL) do not belong to that group of passages which were taken from an apocryphal Gospel.

The passages taken from this Gospel may also be reckoned to include the two references in Eusebius, *Theophaneia* (IV and V).

The Latin translator of Origen's Commentary on Matthew refers to the Gospel according to the Hebrews (III). We have, however, no reason to assume that this Gospel was ever used outside Egypt. In addition to this we see that the contents of this reference show a close resemblance to a passage in the Gospel of Matthew. From this we may draw the conclusion that the passage was originally part of the Gospel according to the Nazoreans.

One of the references in *To Ioudaïkon* is also found in Jerome's *adv. Pelagianum* III 2, where the Gospel according to the Nazoreans appears to have been quoted (XXIV). This, together with the fact that all references can be compared with passages in the Gospel of Matthew, shows that they also

⁸³ See p. 18.

⁸⁴ The opinion that Jerome depends on Origen is well established, especially since Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 343, and G. Bardy, *Saint Jérôme et l'Évangile selon les Hébreux*, *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* III (1946) 5-36, esp. 31. Schneemelcher I⁵, 146-147 (Strecker), ascribed the same four passages in Jerome to the Gospel acc. to the Hebrews.

belong to the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans. This brings us to the following list.

- Eusebius, the talents (IV)
the good ones (V)
- Jerome, *maar* (XVI)
 - caementarius* (XVII)
 - Berachiah* (XVIII)
 - Barabbas* (XIX)
 - superliminare* (XX)
 - ignorantia est* (XXIII)
 - with *To Ioudaïkon, sermo peccati* (XXIV)
- *To Ioudaïkon, ἀγίαν πόλιν* (XXV)
 - τὸ εἰκῆ (XXVI)
 - ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου (XXVII)
 - ὑπὲρ ὄφεις (XXVIII)
 - διαρπάζεται (XXIX)
 - εὐχαριστῶ σε (XXX)
 - τρεῖς ἡμέρας (XXXI)
 - κορβᾶν (XXXII)
 - Matth. 16,2-3
 - ὑπὲρ Ἰωάννου (XXIV)
 - καὶ ἡρύσσαστο (XXXV)
 - ἄνδρας ἐνόπλους (XXXVI)
- Origen, *Comment. on Matthew*, The Rich Young Man (III).

The History of the Jewish-Christian Gospels

We came to the conclusion that the three Jewish-Christian Gospels were written in three different places but all in the second century. We arrived at this view, however, with the help of sources of a much later date. This raises the question as to what happened to these three Gospels after the time of their composition.

The Gospel according to the Ebionites is only known from Epiphanius who quoted from this Gospel about two centuries after its origin. Epiphanius gives the impression that he knew this Gospel in its entirety. He does not say where he discovered it or whether it was still used in his own time. This means that the whole history of Gospel must remain a mystery.

The Gospel according to the Hebrews which was written in the second century was used by Clement about fifty years after its composition, by Origen less than a century later and by Didymus the Blind more than two hundred years after its date of origin. We came to the conclusion that its contents were generally known in the time of Clement, Origen and even Didymus among Egyptian Christians in general. It is, however, difficult to say whether Clement and Origen were in the possession of the entire text. We cannot exclude the

possibility that they were aware of some better-known passages only because they happened to be part of the Egyptian Christian tradition. But this does not mean to say that the Gospel was not widely used at some time and that its contents were not generally known.

We also came to the conclusion that Jerome added a number of quotations to those known from Egyptian writers although he himself did not possess direct knowledge of this Gospel. He depends on Origen but other sources cannot be excluded. His statements about the translation of this Gospel are pure fantasy. He assumed that he was dealing with a Gospel that was originally written in Hebrew. He, therefore, tells his readers that he himself is responsible for the translation of this work into Greek and Latin. We can say that his work was confined to the translation into Latin of an occasional quotation which he found in Origen's Greek writings.

This means that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was known in Egypt only. There is no reason whatsoever to assume that this Gospel was translated from the original Greek.

The Gospel according to the Nazoraeans apparently found its way into the Library of Caesarea where it was probably used by Eusebius and where it was still present in the time of Jerome. It may have been used by the sect of the Nazoraeans in the fourth century.

We also have to consider the question whether the text was translated by Jerome. It is remarkable that of Jerome's seven references to this Gospel only one (*in Matth. 12,13, XVII*) is said to have been translated from Hebrew into Greek. We wonder why it was necessary to speak of a translation into Greek. If applied to the Gospel according to the Hebrews such a statement would have been appropriate because Jerome took his quotations from a Greek author. Here, however, he was working with a Gospel known to him in Aramaic. We could assume that the text of the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans was present in the Library of Caesarea in a Greek translation. But it is also possible that the present introduction to the passage in *Matth. 12,13* was inspired by the introductions Jerome used in connection with passages taken from Origen.⁸⁵

The text of this Gospel was, however, not only known to Jerome. Passages were also found in the Latin translation of Origen's Commentary on Matthew and in marginal notes in some New Testament manuscripts. Both ask for our consideration.

The author of the translation of Origen's commentary wrote in Latin but we wonder whether he took the reference to the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans from an Aramaic, a Greek or a Latin text.

⁸⁵ This conclusion is corroborated by Jerome's procedure in connection with his Latin *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos*. He used already existing Jewish Greek translations of the Hebrew text although he suggests that he has translated it from the *hebraica veritas*, see C. Estin, *Les Psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures*, *Collectanea Biblica Latina* 15 (San Girolamo, Roma 1984).

It is unlikely that the translator took it from an original Aramaic text. It is, however, difficult to decide whether he used a Greek or a Latin text. The many variant readings which can be found in this quotation have points of similarity with Greek manuscripts of the New Testament which seems to indicate that a Greek text has been used. But this need not mean that the translator was in possession of the entire text of this Gospel in Greek. He might also have depended on some earlier source in which this quotation happened to be present.

The references to *To Ioudaïkon* demand our special attention. They are in Greek which again raises the question of whether this Gospel has been known in a Greek version. The references were discovered in the following manuscripts of the New Testament:

- 4 Paris, *Bibl. Nat. Gr.* 84, 13th cent., at Matth. 26,74.⁸⁶
- 273 Paris, *Bibl. Nat. Gr.* 79, 13th cent., also at Matth. 26,74, but now part of the text itself. The manuscripts 4 and 273 are "sisters".⁸⁷
- 566 Leningrad 54, 9/10th cent., first part of a minuscule of which the second part (called Δ) is written in majuscules, at Matth. 4,5; 16,17 and 18,22.⁸⁸
- 899 Uppsala, *Univ. 4 Sparvenfeld* 45, 11th cent. at Matth. 12,40 and 26,74.⁸⁹
- 1424 Maywood III, *Theol. Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, MS 102, 11th cent., at Matth. 5,22; 7,5; 10,16; 11,12 and 25; 15,5; 16,2-3; 26,74 and 27,65.⁹⁰

An important question is whether these manuscripts are related to one another. If this is the case, it should be possible to discover the source of these references. Schmidtke devoted a study to this problem and he came to the conclusion that they can be called "Zion-Manuscripts" because they have a colophon in which it is said that the text has been compared with manuscripts which were present on Mount Zion.⁹¹

However, of the five manuscripts mentioned above only two, viz. 566 and 899, have this colophon.⁹² This makes it almost impossible to reduce them all to this common denominator. Two of these manuscripts were written in Southern Italy, viz. 4 and 273, which might be an indication that their text is of Eastern origin and even related to that of Jerusalem,⁹³ but the others have a different

⁸⁶ See C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments I* (Leipzig 1900) 128-129.

⁸⁷ Gregory, *o.c.*, 174.

⁸⁸ Gregory, *o.c.*, 203-204, and K. Treu, *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments in der UdSSR, Texte u. Unters.* 91 (Berlin 1966) 48-50.

⁸⁹ Gregory, *o.c.*, 231.

⁹⁰ See K. W. Clark, *A descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America* (Chicago 1937) Plate XXIV.

⁹¹ Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* 1-31.

⁹² The colophon reads ἔγραψή καὶ ἀτεβλήθη ἐκ τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμοις παλαιῶν ἀντιγράφων τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀγίῳ δρει ἀποκειμένων.

⁹³ A number of manuscripts which were written in Southern Italy like 20 157 164 262 300 376 and 543 have some striking additions to the text, see J. Rendel Harris, *The Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament* (London 1887) 62-66, which would seem to demonstrate their Eastern origin. For example in many of these manuscripts the patriarchates are given in the order Jerusalem, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch. Of Jerusalem it is said: πρώτος

origin. We do not see any common feature of these manuscripts which would help us to solve the question about the source of these marginal notes. They are only part of a great number of similar references in manuscripts of the New Testament, both textual and exegetical. It is not impossible that they were taken from some commentary on Matthew unknown to us.⁹⁴ If this is true, these references do not say that a Greek version of the entire text existed. We may be dealing with incidental translations from some Aramaic original.

It is still remarkable that the word *To Ioudaïkon* has been chosen to indicate the source of these references.⁹⁵ It seems to show that the author who referred to this text was no longer aware of a relation of this text to the Nazoraeans.

The following conclusions can be drawn. The Gospel according to the Nazoraeans must have been known to more authors than just Eusebius and Jerome. It appears that it was also known to Greek authors. The isolated passages on which this conclusion is based do not prove that the entire text must have been present in Greek.

We shall continue to describe the history of the Jewish Christian Gospels with help of a group of Latin writers after Jerome. We leave aside those who clearly depend on Jerome. We shall only give their names: Pseudo-Abdias (XV), Gregory of Tours (XV), Sedulius Scottus (XI, XV and XVI), Jacob a Voragine (XV), Rabanus Maurus (XVII), Zacharias Chrysopolitanus (XIX), Petrus Comestor (XVII and XX), Paschasius Radbertus (XVII, XVIII, XIX, XXVIII and XL), Christian of Stavelot (XCX), Hugo of St. Cher (XX and XXI), *Historia Passionis Domini* (XX) and the Irish Reference Bible (XV).

Next, we know of a few passages which can be explained on the basis of stories in Jerome's writings like the account of the conversion of the Jews in Haimo Halberstensis, Hugo of St. Cher and *Historia Passionis Domini* (XLVI) and that about Jesus' radiant eyes in Petrus de Riga (XLVI). To these we may also reckon the story about the four soldiers in *Historia Passionis Domini* (LV).

All these references are not important for our knowledge of the history of the Jewish-Christian Gospels.

Θρόνος καὶ πρώτη πατριαρχία Ἱεροσολύμων Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀδελφοθέου καὶ ἀποστόλου ... (the text of Leicester Codex 69). Professor J. W. Wevers, Toronto, informed me (20th of August 1986) that the references to 'τὸ ιούδ' in the Greek text of the Old Testament (Gen. 40,9 and 43,11 in MS. 56, Gen. 47,31 in F^b and Ex. 16,31 in F^{b1}) are of unknown origin.

⁹⁴ Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente*, supposed that the marginal notes have been taken from a Commentary on Matthew written by Apollinaris. Since J. Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche, Texte u. Unters.* 61 (Leipzig 1957), was able to reconstruct part of this work the hypothesis has become improbable, see p. XXVI.

⁹⁵ See Gutbrod, s.v. 'Ιορδάη etc., *Theol. Wörterb.* z. N.T. III, 356-394. The word does not say anything about the language but only that something or some person is related to the Jewish people, cf. Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 170 and 245, ed. L. Cohn-P. Wendland, ed. minor VI (Berolini 1915) 152 and 166; *Letter of Aristeas* 22, 24, 28, 121 and 176, ed. A. Pelletier, *Sourc. Chrét.* 89 (Paris 1962) 114, 116, 118, 164 and 184; *Titus* 1,14 and *Constit. Apost.* V 12 5; VI 6 1; 27 1; 30 1; VIII 1 10 and 32 14, ed. Funk 269, 313, 369, 381, 464 and 536.

Next there are a number of stories which can be explained from the use of Infancy or Passion Narratives like the story about the Three Kings in Sedulius Scottus and the Gospel of Maelbrigte (XL), the face of Mary in Hugo of St. Cher (XLVIII), the resurrection of two men in Hugo of St. Cher (XLVIII) and Joseph in prison in Hugo of St. Cher (XLIX). Finally we know two purely legendary stories ascribed to a Jewish-Christian Gospel, viz. that about the miracles in Bezaida (XLIV) and the Seventeen Miracles during Jesus' birth (LVI).

Of unknown origin are the following: *VII dies pascae* (XLIII), the appearance to Mary (L), the washing of the feet (LII), about Luke 22 (LIII), about John (LIV) and about the donkeys (LVI).

Three of these may be interesting, namely the story about the appearance to Mary, which is an ancient tradition already present in the Diatessaron, the *VII dies pascae* which is in an obviously Jewish-Christian tradition and the story about the donkeys which shows a Jewish custom. We can not exclude the possibility that they have been part of some Jewish-Christian Gospel or tradition. However, this does not say that the author of these passages must have been acquainted with the contents of this Gospel. They may be explained on the basis of ancient Christian exegetical traditions.

The above may corroborate the conclusion already reached earlier that the Gospel according to the Nazoreans may have been known and used by some unknown Greek commentator. Whether he discovered the text in Aramaic or Greek is unknown. But we may say that knowledge about its contents must have faded away at a very early date after Jerome.⁹⁶

Sources

The three Jewish-Christian Gospels were composed with help of various sources.

The Gospel according to the Hebrews is known from seven quotations (I, II, XIII, XIV, XV, XXI and XXII). These passages display no immediate parallels with passages in the New Testament. This means that, as far as we know, this Gospel was composed without the help of canonical traditions. On the other hand we assume that the general structure of this Gospel did not differ much

⁹⁶ B. Bischoff, *Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter, Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart 1966) 205-273 (also in: *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1954) 189-279, esp. 215-216), states that Jerome translated the Gospel of the Hebrews and supposes that it "offenbar bei den Iren wenigstens bis zum IX. Jahrhundert ganz oder in beträchtlichen Teilen vorhanden gewesen". M. McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin 1975) 42: "The Gospel according to the Hebrews known to the Irish seems to have contained both an Infancy narrative and a narrative covering Christ's public life; even, it would appear, his post-resurrection appearances". It seems now to be sufficiently clear that the Gospel according to the Nazoreans, not to mention the Gospel according to the Hebrews, was never in Ireland and that nothing can be said about its contents based upon references in Irish writers or in Irish theological works.

from that of the canonical ones. The contents obviously consisted of a life of Jesus which spoke of his baptism (XXI), his resurrection (XV) and his temptation in the desert or his transfiguration (II). Catechetical material must also have been part of it (I, XIV and XXII).

The tradition which was used in this Gospel must have been circulating in the Christian community because it is known from other sources as well (cf. I). A characteristic of this material must have been the influence of traditions which had been taken from the LXX (cf. I and II), but also from other Greek translations of the Old Testament (cf. XXII). Sometimes an underlying Semitic substratum of these traditions is still discernable (cf. II, XIII and XIV).

There is a striking agreement to be found in ancient Christian literature (cf. XXI). The same applies to the use of various ancient Christian expressions (cf. XV)..

The Gospel reflects material which was current during a pre-canonical period. Events taken from the life of Jesus have been interpreted in a very special way with help of Jewish ideas which were present in a Hellenistic environment. Some of these ideas were quite widely known and can be found in Justin Martyr, Tertullian (XXI) or the Diatessaron (XIV). Some must have been of a more local character.

All this means that this Gospel is very important for our knowledge of the origin of the Gospels in general. We may assume that some rudimentary idea existed of the life of Jesus into whose framework various events have been inserted. This material already shows a particular theological development and reflection. It appears that this material was shared with other Christians but that part of it was also confined to various isolated communities.

The Gospel according to the Nazoreans must also have consisted of a "life of Jesus". Jesus' baptism (XXIII), his suffering (XIX and XXXV) and his death (XX and XXIV) must have been part of this work. Now, as in the past, its contents are continuously compared to those of the Gospel of Matthew. This, however, does not mean to say that the author of the Gospel according to the Nazoreans depended upon Matthew. The Story of the Rich Young Man (III) and the Parable of the Talents (IV) are different from the parallel passages in Matthew. The Gospel according to the Nazoreans shows occasional (XVII, XXXV) or substantial additions (V, XXIII, XXIV, XXVII, XXXIV) when compared to Matthew. Other passages make clear that this Gospel was aware of particular traditions with regard to material also present in Matthew (the name Barabbas in XIX and *superluminare* in XX). The only explanation for all this is that this Gospel originated in an environment in which traditions used by the Gospel of Matthew were known but that such traditions had a different development.⁹⁷

⁹⁷ The problem with regard to the origin of the Gospel of Matthew cannot be adequately dealt with here. However, one becomes more and more aware that Matthew is the product of a gradual development having as its final redactor a Gentile-Christian, see for example E.L. Abel, Who wrote Matthew ?, *NTS* 17 (1971) 138-152, and M. Lowe and D. Flusser, Evidence corroborating a modified Proto-Matthew Synoptic Theory, *NTS* 29 (1983) 25-47. G. Howard, *The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text* (Macon, Georgia 1987), tried to reconstruct a very

We see that here too some of the ideas in this Gospel were widely known among early Christian authors. The name "good ones" is also found in the Pseudo-Clementine writings (V). In the story about the *superluminare* elements are present which can be found in Greek commentators (XX). The idea of mourning the Holy Spirit is present in *Pastor Hermae* (XXII), and the explanation of Matthew 15,5 with regard to the Pharisees can be found in the Diatessaron (XXXII).

We know that the Gospel was written in Aramaic but we wonder what language its source was composed in. The word play around the name Barabbas seems to presuppose a Semitic environment (XIX), but the explanation of the difficult Greek word ἐπιούσιος seems to demand a Greek-speaking community (XVI). The most plausible explanation is that the "Matthean" sources originated in a bilingual environment. We are at the border line between Aramaic- and Greek-speaking Christians. Finally the sources found their way into the Gospel of Matthew which was written in Greek, and into the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans, which was written in Hebrew/Aramaic.

We may conclude that the origins of the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans are not much different from those of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Both were composed with help of the available tradition about the life of Jesus. However, one originated in a Greek-speaking and the other in an Aramaic speaking environment, each with its own cultural and religious background.

The Gospel according to the Ebionites was composed with the help of the three synoptic Gospels. It has already been said that this harmonising tendency was not restricted to the Diatessaron but must have been a feature of a certain environment and period in time. After the appearance of the Gospels there clearly existed a general effort to combine their contents into one book. All this is to be explained on the basis of a general need to bring together oral and written Christian traditions into one document. This continued until the time that the four Gospels finally became "canonical".⁹⁸ In spite of the presence of many parallel passages the text itself differed from that offered in the synoptic Gospels. This appears from the beginning of this Gospel (VI) and the account

early Hebrew text of Matthew which is held to display primitive elements, see also G. Howard, A Primitive Gospel of Matthew and the *Tol'doth Yeshu*, *NTS* 34 (1988) 60-70. However, G. E. Howard, Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew, *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Division A. The Period of the Bible (Jerusalem 1986) 223-230, has to admit: "A comparison of Shem-Tob's Matthew with quotations of Matthew in earlier Christian and Jewish documents produced another surprising result. First a comparison of this text with quotations of the so-called Hebrew/Aramaic Matthew or of apocryphal Hebrew/Aramaic Gospels, referred to or quoted in Irenaeus (sic), Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius and especially Jerome showed that no relationship exists between them". This has been confirmed by my own observations.

⁹⁸ See again M. D. A. Bertrand, L'Évangile des Ébionites. Une harmonie évangélique antérieure au Diatessaron, *NTS* 26 (1980) 548-563; G. Strecker, Eine Evangelienharmonie bei Justin und Pseudoklemens? *NTS* 24 (1978) 297-316.

of Jesus' baptism (IX). The author of this Gospel freely added traditions to the text in order to show his ideas about a vegetarian life (VII and XIII) and about sacrifices (XI).

The origins of this Gospel differ from those of the other two. The other were composed in a situation in which the Gospels were still in the making. Their origins are part of a general effort to compose "Lives of Jesus". The Gospel according to the Ebionites is a kind of reaction to the results of this development. Some Christians could not find their particular ideas in the available Gospel texts and added therefore their own ideas.

Our final conclusion must be that the origin of the Jewish-Christian Gospels have been insufficiently considered in studies about the background of the so-called canonical Gospels. We have seen that Jewish-Christian Gospels share a common background with the Gospel texts of the New Testament.

Christology

Finally we shall look at the christological ideas of the three Jewish-Christian Gospels. Our remarks remain tentative because they are perforce based upon a limited number of passages.

The six quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews (I, II, XIII, IV, XV, XXI and XXII) show that we are dealing with a life of Jesus which gives accounts of his baptism and his resurrection. Although they are small in number, we, nevertheless meet a consistent group of theological ideas.

It seems hardly necessary to repeat that the theological conception of this Gospel is dominated by Jewish-Christian Wisdom Theology. Wisdom is represented in this Gospel by the Holy Spirit who is called "Mother". Various features of this Wisdom/Mother can be found. Her activity is encountered in the realm of prophecy. She inspires and gives insight, but she also calls the prophet and appoints the place where the prophet has to do his work. The Holy Spirit takes Jesus by his hair and brings him to Mount Thabor. It is a well-known idea which is found in connection with Habbakuk, Ezechiel, Mani and with the Apostle Paul in Acts (II). The Spirit descends upon man but according to this Gospel it is Jesus in particular who is looked for. Anybody who possesses the Spirit may be called Son but Jesus is the Son with a very special mission.

One of the characteristics of the Spirit is that man starts a new life during which he gradually comes nearer to his destination. To reach the final stage is to reign and rest. In this situation man has arrived at a point at which he is invulnerable to evil forces which are now subjected to him. After his baptism Jesus is said to reign into eternity.

The course of events around Jesus' resurrection must have deviated from that in the canonical Gospels. Here James the brother of Jesus obviously played a prominent part, but in all other respects we see that the nature of the appearance of Jesus does not differ very much from that in New Testament passages.

We may conclude that the group within which this Gospel originated was probably small and clearly separated from the world in which it lived. It consisted of people who were held to possess the Spirit. This was a source of joy and had to be cherished (XIV and XXII). The persons who belonged to the group were known to one another. They probably came together in order to "break bread" according to an established custom (XV).

This does not say that Christianity in Egypt, the place of origin of this Gospel, was represented by a small group of *fratres* only. The group which was responsible for this Gospel was merely one of many similar Christian communities. We came to the conclusion that parts of this Gospel were widely known. This means that these Christian traditions were widespread. However, Christianity in Egypt was typically experienced within small groups. In other words, the Gospel according to the Hebrews is a product of one of the early Egyptian Wisdom Schools.⁹⁹

The Gospel according to the Nazoreans is known from twenty-two passages (III-V, XVI-XX, XXIII-XXXVI) but many of these do not say very much about the theological contents of this Gospel. It is not usually quoted for any theological aim but to clarify some passage or words in the Gospel of Matthew. Nevertheless, we are able to draw some conclusions.

This Gospel is preoccupied with the Jewish Law and the Jewish people. Although the Rich Young Man is supposed to have followed the Law, he is not able to fulfil the commandment to love his neighbour which, in this case, means that he does not want to divide his possessions among "his brothers, the sons of Abraham" (III). The Parable of the Talents is directed against those who live extravagantly. Nobody seems to be absolutely free of sin. Jesus could have committed a sin *in ignorantia* (XXIII) and the prophets could have committed a *sermo peccati* (XXIV). Those who do not do the will of the Father will be cast away from him. The Jewish leaders are those who use the word *κορόνταν* (XXXII). The destruction of the lintel of the temple is a sign of the coming destruction of the whole building (XX). Jerusalem is not called "holy city" (XXV). Barabbas is the son of "his father", which probably means the devil (XIX).

The entire Gospel breathes the spirit of Judaism with which it seems to be in constant debate. For the author of this Gospel the Jews are the children of Abraham who are not following and are unable to follow the Law. His anger is especially directed against the leaders of the Jews and, so it seems, Jewish institutions like the temple.

⁹⁹ See for the early Christian Church in Egypt M. Hornschuh, *Die Anfänge des Christentums in Ägypten*, Inaugural Diss., Friedrich-Wilhelm-Universität (Bonn 1959); C. Detlef G. Müller, *Geschichte der orientalischen Nationalkirchen, Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* 2 (Göttingen 1981) 321, and C.H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London 1979) 49. My own ideas are set out in A. F. J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christiianity in Egypt, The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. by B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring (Philadelphia 1986) 161-175.

The community within which the Gospel originated must again have been a small one. Here also the members feel themselves to have been chosen by God (V) and expect to live with each other as brothers (III). The brothers apparently lived in poor conditions which sometimes obliged them to beg for alms (XVII).

It is impossible to say anything about its christological ideas by lack of specific references. We can only say that the Gospel contained a life of Jesus in which there must have been some account of his baptism (XXIII) and his death (XIX, XX, XXV and XXXVI).¹⁰⁰

The Gospel according to the Ebionites was quoted by Epiphanius to show its absurdities. The selection of the references is, therefore, arbitrary and probably does not indicate the real contents of the Gospel. Nothing was seemingly said about Jesus' birth. During his baptism Jesus is chosen as God's son. At that moment God generated him (IX). This means that there is a total absence of ideas about Wisdom or an assumption that Jesus is a prophet. He is the Chosen One and at the moment that this becomes evident a light radiates. He is held to fulfil everything. His twelve apostles have been elected to be a testimony to Israel. Nothing is known of Jesus' death and resurrection. The last supper is eaten but Epiphanius emphasizes that Jesus does not eat meat (XXI). John the Baptist was also a vegetarian (VII). This, and the abolishment of sacrifices, is especially emphasized by Epiphanius.

This Gospel obviously represents the ideas of some of the many Jewish-Christian groups which lived east of the river Jordan. Our knowledge of them is limited. We mainly depend on what is said in the so-called Pseudo-Clementine Writings with which it shares a rejection of meat and sacrifices.¹⁰¹

Epilogue

The presence of three Jewish Christian Gospels is an established fact.¹⁰² They

¹⁰⁰ The most important source for our knowledge of the Nazoreans is provided by a number of quotations from their interpretation of Isaiah quoted by Jerome, see A. F. J. Klijn, Jerome's Quotations from a Nazorean Interpretation of Isaiah, *Judéo-Christianisme, Recherches historiques et théologiques offertes en hommage au Cardinal Jean Damelou, Rech. de Science Religieuse* 60 (1972) 241-255, see also R. A. Pritz, Nazarene Jewish Christianity, *Studia Post-Biblica* 37 (Leiden 1988) 57-70. This book has to be read with a critical eye as far as it deals with the Jewish-Christian Gospels.

¹⁰¹ The best book about the Pseudo-Clementines is still G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristeatum der Pseudoklementinen, Texte u. Unters.* 70 (Berlin 1959).

¹⁰² For the sake of completeness we should look at a number of references and contributions which have been left out of consideration. Bischoff, *art. cit.* 253, quotes from a manuscript in Würzburg, M.p.th. f.61, 8/9th cent.: *idest Mariasa nomine* (see Matth. 9,20); *Regina, idest Meroe, austrio idest Aethiopiae* (see Matth. 12,42) and *Homo Malchus nomine et caementarius fuit* (see Matth. 12,10), but this information is not said to have been taken from a Jewish-Christian Gospel. We might add that the name Meroe has been obviously derived from *αιμορροῦσα*, see J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims. Before the Crusaders* (Warminster 1977) 63. Nicephorus, *Quae Scripturae Canonicae*, Migne, PG 100, 1050A: Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἐβραιοὺς στίχοι βς' (2200). He reckons the Gospel among the ἀντιλεγόμενα. See also Philip de Side quoted with C. de Boor, *Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierius...aus der Kirchengeschichte des*

are the representatives of three Jewish-Christian groups which can be clearly distinguished. One should be located in Egypt, the second in the region around Beroia and the third somewhere east of the river Jordan. The Gospel according to the Hebrews is an authentic product of Egyptian Christianity. The Gospel according to the Nazoraeans and that according to the Ebionites were composed within small groups; the group responsible for the Gospel according to the Ebionites is difficult to define. The Nazoraeans spoke Aramaic. Their Gospel was obviously present in the library of Caesarea and became the best known and the most influential of the three.

The contents of these Gospels reflect ideas which are also found elsewhere, but each of them represents a special branch of Jewish-Christianity which was a far from homogeneous whole.

In this light the contents of the Gospels contribute to a better understanding of what is commonly called Jewish-Christianity, but which could just as easily be called the earliest form of Christianity. We have seen that many ideas present in these Gospels can also be found in the generality of early Christian writers.

These Gospels have also made an important contribution to the field of the development of what may be called Gospel tradition. The Gospel according to the Hebrews and that according to the Nazoraeans were composed according to the same principles as the canonical Gospels. We have further concluded that the origin of the Gospel of Matthew cannot be disassociated from that of the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans. They represent two separate developments of the same basic community. The Gospel according to the Ebionites is a representative of a wide-spread attempt in early Christianity to harmonise Gospel traditions on the basis of existing Gospels.¹⁰³

The names "apocryphal" and "Jewish-Christian" Gospels have tended to isolate the contents of these works, as far as they are still known. In modern studies the Gospel traditions of Jewish-Christian origin have been put into the same category as other Christian literary products, which have been considered

Sidetes, *Texte u. Unters.* V 2 (Leipzig 1888) 169: εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα εὐαγγέλια ψευδῆ, τὸ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ κατὰ Βασιλεῖσθαι, see Origen p. 6. Theodoret of Cyr, *Comp. Haer. Fab.* II, Migne, PG 83, 388C (about the Ebionites): Μόνου δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ἐβραιοὺς εὐαγγέλιον δέχονται. The manuscript B. L. add. 17 215 does not refer to the Gospel according to the Hebrews as has been suggested by Harnack, *Gesch. der altchristl. Lit.* I/I, 10. The text reads: "And he confirmed the book (Gospel) of Matthew, that was with the Hebrews showing that the Messiah was born of David and Abraham..." The following publications are useless for our purpose: J.R. Harris, *The Gospel of the Twelve Apostles together with the Apocalypse of each of them*. Edited from the Syriac MS with a Translation and Introduction (Cambridge 1900); A. Jacoby, *Ein neues Evangelienfragment* (Strassburg 1900), and E. Revillont, *Les Apocryphes Coptes. Publiés et Traduits I: Les évangiles des Douze Apôtres et de Saint Barthélemy, Patrol. Orient* II (Paris 1907) 123-184.

¹⁰³ See T. Baarda, ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ - ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ. Factors in the Harmonisation of the Gospels. Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian, *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, ed. W. L. Petersen (Notre Dame/London 1989) 133-156.

"apocryphal" in some way or another. It is now time to give the Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition equal treatment to the so-called canonical Gospels.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴ See also A. F. J. Klijn, *The Study of Jewish Christianity*, *NTS* 20 (1973/4) 419-431.

PART TWO

TEXT AND COMMENTARY

I

Clement of Alexandria, *stromata* II IX 45 5

ed. O. Stählin, *GCS*, Clemens Alexandrinus II (Leipzig 1906) 137
202/215

Source: Gospel according to the Hebrews

ἢ κάν τῷ καθ' Ἐβραίους εὐαγγελίῳ ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει γέγραπται καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαίσεται.

As it is also written in the Gospel according to the Hebrews: He who has become astonished will become king and he who has become king will rest.

Parallel Texts

1. Clement of Alexandria, *stromata* V XIV 96 3

ed. O. Stählin, *GCS*, Clemens Alexandrinus II (Leipzig 1906) 389
202/215

ἴσον γὰρ τούτοις ἔκεινα δύναται· οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν, ἔως ἂν εὕρῃ· εὑρὼν δὲ θαυμάθησεται, θαυμηθεὶς δὲ βασιλεύσει, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαίσεται.

For similar to these the following is possible: He who seeks will not cease until he finds and having found he will marvel and having marvelled he will become king and having become king, he will rest.

2. *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* 654,5-9

ed. B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* Part IV (London 1904) 4.
Reconstruction according to J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Oxyrhynchus Logoi of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas*, *Theological Studies* 20 (1959) 505-560, esp. 516-518, and O. Höfli, *Das Koptische Thomasevangelium und die Oxyrhynchus-Papyri* nr. 1, 654 und 655, *Evangelische Theologie* 20 (1960) 21-42 and 182-192, esp. 27-29
end 3rd cent.

μὴ παυσάσθε ὁ ζητῶν τοῦ ζητεῖν ἔως ἂν]
εὕρῃ καὶ ὅταν εὕρῃ [θαυμάθησεται καὶ θαυμ-]

βηθεὶς βασιλεύσει, καὶ βασιλεύσας ἀναπα-]
ήσεται.

Let him who seeks not cease seeking until he finds and when he has found he will marvel and having marvelled he will become king and having become king he will rest.

3. Gospel of Thomas 2 80,14-19

ed. A. Guillaumont a.o., *The Gospel according to Thomas* (Leiden-London 1959) 2-3
beg. 2nd cent.

λῆπτρεγ' λο ἦσι πετ' ψινε εὐψινε ψαντεγ' σινε ατω ροταν'
εψωανσινε ψηλα ὑπτρή ατω εψωανστορτρή ψηλα (blank)
ψηηρε ατω ψηλα ῥρο εξα πτηρυ

Let him who seeks not cease seeking until he finds and when he has found he will marvel and having marvelled he will become king and having become king he will rest.

Commentary

The *logion* is known in four different versions. We first have to go into their literary relationship.

Clement quotes the passage twice, once mentioning and a second time without mentioning his source. The first time he obviously gives part of the *logion* only. We may be allowed to supplement the first quotation with help of the second one but nevertheless two variant readings remain to be discussed.

In the first passage the word θαυμάζω has been used and in the second θαυμβέω. The word θαυμβέω seems to be original.¹ In the context in which the first passage is found the word θαυμάζω is discussed. Clement refers to Plato, *Theaetetus*, where the idea is supposed to be the beginning of philosophy.² This certainly influenced the use of the word in the reference. This conclusion is corroborated by *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* where the word θαυμβέω has also been used.

Next we see that in the first quotation Clement uses the word ἐπαναπαήσεται and in the second the word ἀναπαήσεται. There is no difference in meaning between the two words but since *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus*

¹ The two words can be translated in more than one way. Here θαυμάζω has been rendered by "to astonish" and θαυμβέω by "to marvel". The second word can also mean "to frighten".

² See Plato, *Theaetetus* 155d, ed. H. N. Fowler, *Loeb Class. Libr.*, 54, and Hofius, *art. cit.*, 27-28, n. 30.

uses the word ἀναπαήσεται we could conclude that the verb in the second passage of Clement is the original one.

A number of differences exists between Clement and *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus*. This applies to the expression "... who seeks ... seeking" and the use of the word ὅταν in the *Papyrus*. Here the *Papyrus* goes its own way but in the company of the Gospel of Thomas. However, the different words do not result into a different meaning when compared to the references with Clement.³

The Coptic text of the Gospel according to Thomas deviates considerably from the other versions. The addition of the expression "he will be astonished" seems to be of lesser importance.⁴ The words at the end of the passage "and he will become king of the All" are more significant. The author or some redactor of the Gospel according to Thomas seems to be responsible for these words.⁵

The *logion* shows a particular structure which can be shown in the following way. We begin with the passage in *strom. V* with its complete text:

οὐ πάσεται	(-) ... εὕρη	(x) /
εὑρὼν	(x) ... θαυμήσεται	(y) /
θαυμήθεις	(y) ... βασιλεύσει	(z) /
βασιλεύσας	(z) ... ἀναπαήσεται	(+)

strom. II

θαυμάσας	(y) ... βασιλεύσει	(z) /
βασιλεύσας	(z) ... ἀναπαήσεται	(+)

Papyrus Oxyrhynchus

μὴ παυσάσθε	(-) ... εὕρη	(x) /
εὕρη	(x) ... θαυμήθησεται	(y) /
θαυμήθεις	(y) ... βασιλεύσει	(z) /
βασιλεύσας	(z) ... ἀναπαήσεται	(-)

Gospel according to Thomas

not cease	(-) ... finds	(x) /
has found	(x) ... will marvel	(y) /
has marvelled	(y) ... will be astonished	(y) /
will become King	(z) ... over the All	

This structure is an example of the so-called σχήματα λέξεως (*figurae elocutionis*) and is commonly called *κλίμαξ* or *gradatio*. The sentence displays a climax on the basis of this structure which is expressed here in the following

³ In the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* we find the word βασιλεύσῃ in place of βασιλεύσει. This reading is thought to be an error.

⁴ In the Coptic Gospel of Thomas the first verb is *ἰγτήτη* which is used in the New Testament to render words like *ταράσσω* in John 11,33, *ἐκθαμβίζω* in Mark 9,15 and the next verb is *ἰγτήτη* which renders *θαυμάζω* in Mark 15,44 and *ἐκπλήσσω* in Matth. 13,54.

⁵ See for the relationship between *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* and the Coptic Gospel of Thomas Hofius, *art. cit.*, and Fitzmyer, *art. cit.*

way: /...x/x...y/y...z/.⁶ We see that the quotation in Clement and that in *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* is more faithful to this structure than the passage in the Gospel according to Thomas in which the order is twice disturbed. It begins with a negative statement but does not end with a positive one and it introduces the word "astonished" which spoils the evenly distributed parts of the *logion*.⁷ This again seems to indicate that the contents of the passage in the Gospel according to Thomas display secondary elements.

Next we must look at the contents of this *logion*. The four parts, viz. seeking/finding, finding/marvelling, marvelling/becoming king and becoming king/resting, can each be separately encountered in various other writings. The same applies to combinations of these parts which occur sometimes with and sometimes without other elements. This means that the *logion* seems to have been constructed with the help of earlier ideas.

The following parallel ideas can be distinguished. The first two can be found in the Acts of Thomas, ch. 136: καὶ οἱ ἀξίως μεταλαμβάνοντες τῶν ἐκεὶ ἄγαθῶν ἀναπαύονται καὶ ἀναπαύμενοι βασιλεύουσιν.⁸ In the Gnostic Book of Thomas the Contender 145,12-14 we read: "For when you come forth from the suffering and passions of the body, you will receive rest from the Good one and you will reign with the King".⁹ We can say that this last quotation is a Gnostic adaptation of the our *logion*. Finally we read in the Second Apocalypse of James 56,2-6: "For your sake (scil. James) they will be told [these things], and will come to rest. For your sake they will reign [and will] become kings".¹⁰

We shall now have a closer look at the various parts. The idea that he who seeks will find is known from Matth. 7,7/Luke 11,9. In our *logion* the imperative form has been strengthened by the words οὐ πάυσέται, an expression known, for example, from Sir. 23,16: οὐ μὴ πάυσεται ἔως ὃν ἐκκαύσῃ πῦρ,¹¹ but also from *Pistis Sophia* ch. 10 and 102, which reads: "Nicht lasset nach zu suchen Tag und Nacht...".¹² This latter is followed, however, by words which differ from those in our *logion*. The idea of seeking God is often encountered in the Old Testament (cf. Ex. 33,7; Deut. 4,29 and combined with finding in I Chron.16,10

⁶ See H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (München 1976⁵) par. 256-258, 84-85, and M. Dibelius, *Der Brief des Jakobus, Krit.-Exeg. Komm. über das N.T.* (Göttingen 1959¹⁰) 92-95.

⁷ It is striking that the Gospel of Thomas seems to use both the words θαυμάζω and θαυμάζω which can be found in Clement but it is impossible that one influenced the other.

⁸ See Lipsius-Bonnet, *Acta Apost. Apocr.* II/2, 243,9-10.

⁹ J. D. Turner, *The Book of Thomas the Contender*, *SBL Dissertation Series* 23 (Missoula Montana 1975) 37 and 192.

¹⁰ See *Nag Hammadi Library in English* translated by Members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (Leiden 1977) 253, and E. Bammel, Rest and Ruhe, *Vig. Christ.* 23 (1969) 88-90.

¹¹ See B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas* (New York 1961) 262, and G. Zaphiris, *Le Texte de l'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu d'après les Citations et des Théologiens grecs du IIe au XVe siècle* (Gémenos 1970) 426-428.

¹² See C. Schmidt-W. Till, *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften I, GCS* (Berlin 1954) 160 and 164, also Hennecke-Schneemelcher I³, 216 and B. Blatz in: Schneemelcher I⁵, 98.

and 21,30; Ps.14,2; 40,17 and 105,3). But knowledge can also be looked for (Prov.18,15) or wisdom (I Chron.1,22). It appears that the expression belongs to the vocabulary of wisdom thinking.¹³

“Astonishment” is the second stage. The context of Clement, *strom. II*, deals with this subject as we noticed above. Here we see that astonishment is the result of man ascending to God. The presence of God among men causes astonishment. It, therefore, is a common subject in the New Testament, where the Son of God was present upon earth (cf. Luke 2,18 and 33; Matth. 8,27/Luke 8,27; Matth. 9,33/Luke 11,14; Matth. 15,31 and 21,20; Acts 2,6,7 and 12).

The following stage is “becoming king”. This idea can be found in Jewish Hellenistic literature and especially the works of Philo (*quod omnis probus sit 42; de mut. nom. 152* : ...ώστε ἀνομολογήσεται κατὰ Μωυσῆν μόνον τὸν σοφὸν βασιλέα; *post Caini 128; sobr. 57; migr. 197* and *somn. II 244*, cf. *Sap. Sal. 6,20*: “Thus the desire of Wisdom leads to kingship”). The idea of becoming king is also well known the New Testament where it is supposed to be an eschatological gift (cf. I Cor. 4,8 and Rev. 5,10).¹⁴

The last stage is “resting” being a gift for those who seek wisdom, according to Sir. 6,27-28; 51,26-27 and *Sap. Sal 8,16*. The idea of “rest” is especially prominent in Gnostic writings.¹⁵ Nevertheless we can see that the author or redactor of the Gospel of Thomas changed the final clause into the idea of becoming king over the All. This agrees with the quotation quoted above from the Acts of Thomas and the Second Apocalypse of James. This emphasis on reigning shows that the true Gnostic is thought to subject everything to himself at the end.

If we look at the various parallels we can conclude that the contents of the *logion* can be explained on the basis of Jewish Wisdom thinking. The various ideas are not particularly Christian, but we assume that the reference has been taken from a Christian text which dealt with the relation between Jesus and those looking for Wisdom. In addition to this it is worth pointing at that the various parallels with writings like Sirach, *Sapientia Salomonis* and Philo seem to indicate that the work from which the passage was taken was written in Egypt.

¹³ See also Greeven, s.v. Κητέω etc., *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T. II*, 894-896, and Gärtner, o.c., 156-158.

¹⁴ See E. Haenchen, *Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums*, *Theol. Bibl. Töpelmann 6* (Berlin 1961) 71; A. J. M. Wedderburn, *The Problem of the Denial of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV, Nov. Test. 23* (1981) 229-241, esp. 234-235, and also H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther, Krit.-Exeget. Komm. über das N.T.* (Göttingen 1969) 106-107.

¹⁵ See for the Gnostic world and its environment J. Helderman, *Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis, Nag Hammadi Studies XVIII* (Leiden 1984).

II

Origen, *Comment. in Johannem* II 12

ed. E. Preuschen, *Der Johanneskommentar, GCS, Origenes IV* (Leipzig 1903) 67
before 228

Source: *Gospel according to the Hebrews*

Ἐὰν δὲ προσιηταί τις τὸ καθ' Ἐβραίους εὐαγγέλιον ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ σωτήρ φησιν· Ἀρτὶ ἐλαφέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου, τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ...

If somebody accepts the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, where the Saviour himself says: A moment ago my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs and brought me to the great hill, the Tabor

Parallel Texts

1. Origen, *Hom. in Jeremiah* XV 4

ed. E. Klostermann, *Jeremiahomilien, GCS, Origenes III* (Leipzig 1901) 128
ca. 244

εἰ δέ τις παραδέχεται τὸ ἄρτι ἐλαφέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου, τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα τὸ Θαβώρ, καὶ τὰ ἔξης...

If somebody accepts (the following): A moment ago my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me and brought me to the great hill, the Thabor, etc.

2. Jerome, *Comment. in Micha* 7,5-7

ed. M. Adriaen, *Commentarii in Prophetas Minores, CCSL LXXVI* (Turnholti 1969) 513
ca. 394

...credideritque euangelio, quod secundum Hebraeos editum nuper transtulimus, in quo ex persona Saluatoris dicitur: Modo tulit me mater mea, sanctus Spiritus, in uno capillorum meorum.

...and who should believe the *Gospel* which is edited according to the *Hebrews* and which we translated not long ago, in which it is said of the person of the Saviour: A moment ago, my Mother, the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs.

3. Jerome, *Comment. in Esaiam* 40,9-11

ed. M. Adriaen, *Commentariorum in Esaiam Libri I-XI, CCSL LXXIII* (Turnholti 1963) 459
408/10

Sed et in euangelio quod iuxta Hebraeos scriptum Nazaraei lectitant, Dominus loquitur: Modo me tulit mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus.

But also in that Gospel written according to the Hebrews which is read by the Nazoraeans, the Lord says: A moment ago my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me up.

Jerome, *Comment. in Hiezechilem* 16,13

ed. F. Glorie, *Commentariorum in Hiezechilem Libri XIV, CCSL LXXV* (Turnholti 1964) 168
410/14

...in euangelio quoque quod Hebraeorum lectitant Nazaraei, Salvator inducitur loquens: Modo me arripuit Mater mea, Spiritus sanctus...

...also in the Gospel which is of the Hebrews and is read by the Nazoraeans, the Saviour is introduced saying: A moment ago my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me up...

Commentary

The relation between the two references given by Origen and the three given by Jerome of the same passage requires our immediate attention.

Jerome does not give more than the beginning of the passage because he is only interested in the idea that the Holy Spirit is a female being. The contents of the references he gives do not deviate from those in Origen. The only variant readings are *tulit* and *arripuit* in Jerome but these can be easily explained if one argues that the same Greek word has been translated in various ways. Thus we need not give further attention to Jerome.

The two passages in Origen are slightly different. Apart from the article before Thabor, we see that in the first passage the word ἀπηνήγκε has been used and in the second ἀνήνεγκε. It is difficult to decide which of these two words is the original one. The word ἀνήνεγκε could have resulted from the influence of Matth. 4,1: τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη, but on the other hand it is also impossible to exclude the influence of Rev. 21,10: καὶ ἀπήνεγκέν με ἐν πνεύματι ἐπὶ ὄρος μέγα καὶ ὑψηλόν...

The passage refers to some event in the life of Jesus. If we look at the canonical Gospels, there are two stories which can be compared to this one. In the story of the temptation of Jesus (cf. Matth. 4,1-11/Mark 1,1-9/Luke 4,1-13)

and in that of the transfiguration (cf. Math. 17,1-9/Mark 9,2-10/Luke 9,28-38) there is reference to a mountain.¹⁶

In the passage about Christ's temptation the following is said according to Math. 4,1: τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη... ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος πειρασθῆναι and this shows similarities to the second passage in Origen: ἔλαβε με... καὶ ἀνήγεικέ με... This, however, leaves the problem that the Temptation did not take place in its entirety on a mountain. According to Matthew, Jesus was brought to a desert and only one of the temptations occurred on a high mountain (ὅρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν, see Math. 4,8). In the passage considered here the mountain is called Thabor, but this is of little help, as we shall see, since Christian tradition places both his Temptation and his Transfiguration on this mountain.

The story of the Transfiguration took place on a mountain but according to the canonical Gospels Jesus went to this place of his own accord. Secondly it was not necessary to speak of this event to his disciples, which is what seems to happen in the passage given by Origen, because three of Jesus' followers were present during it.¹⁷

It is impossible to make any firm statements about the background of the story before we know more about its contents.

The idea that someone has been taken by his hair is not uncommon in biblical tradition. According to the text of the LXX of Ez. 8,3 it is said : καὶ ἔξετεινεν ὁμοίωμα χειρὸς καὶ ἀνέλαβέν με τῆς κορυφῆς μου καὶ ἀνέλαβέν με πνεῦμα ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς γῆς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἤγαγέν με εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ... The agreement is striking because there is not only talk of the Holy Spirit in both passages, but we also meet the word (ἀν)ε λαβέν. The second relevant passage is in Bel and Draco 5,36 which runs as follows: Καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτοῦ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου τοῦ Ἀμβρακούμ τῆς κόμης αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπάνω τοῦ λάκκου τοῦ ἐν Βαρθυλῶνι. To this we may add a parallel taken from the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch VI 3 : "And see, suddenly a strong Spirit took me up and carried me above the wall of Jerusalem" and passages in Acts 8,26; 13,2 and 16,7 according to which man has been brought to a certain place by the Holy Spirit. Finally we draw attention to a passage in the so-called Kölner Mani Kodex 55,16-23 in which it is said of Mani : ...έξα[ι]φνης ἡρπ[ασέν] με π[νεύμα τὸ] ζῶν καὶ ἀν[ήγεικεν βί]αι μεγίστη[ι καὶ με κατέ]στησεν κα[τὰ τὸ ἄκρον] ὅρους ὑψη[λοτάτου]...¹⁸

The idea that the Holy Spirit is a feminine being is well known in Hebrew and Syriac texts and this is also the reason why Jerome was interested in this

¹⁶ See also W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu* 147; M.-J. Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 172-173, and H. Vielhauer, in: Hennecke-Schneemelcher I², 105.

¹⁷ This quite unlike the temptation during which nobody is supposed to have been present. It is striking that according to Ps. Clement, *Homil. XI* 35 3, ed. B. Rehm-J. Irmscher-F. Paschke, *GCS* (Berlin 1969) 171,10-13 and XIX 2 2-3, 353,15-16, Jesus himself tells his disciples what happened during the Temptation.

¹⁸ See The Cologne Mani Codex (P. Colom. inv. nr. 4780) 55,16-23, ed. R. Cameron and A. J. Dewey, *SBL Text and Translations* 15 (Scholars Press 1979) 42.

passage. The second step is to conclude that the Spirit was "Mother". This may go back to pre-Christian Syriac or Mesopotamian sources,¹⁹ but it seems a logical conclusion. For example, we find in Philo, *de ebr.* 30 "One mentions father and mother together, but their significance (αι δυνάμεις) is different. Thus we shall, for example, call the creator (δημιουργόν) rightly also Father of what has come into existence, but Mother the knowledge (έπιστήμην) of him who created. With her God has lived together (συνών) and he has brought forth creation (έσπειρε γένεσιν), but not in the way of men. She, however, received God's seed and she brought forth the only beloved perceptible son (τὸν μόνον καὶ ἀγαπητὸν αἰσθητὸν ἀπεκύνοε), this world, as a ripe fruit with pains". This idea was taken over by Christian tradition. Wisdom is held to have sons not only in Sir. 4,11, but also according to Luke 7,35. The Syriac author Aphraates writes that as long as man is not married he loves God and he serves Him as his Father and the Holy Spirit as his Mother.²⁰ In the Syriac Acts of Thomas the Holy Spirit is repeatedly called Mother.²¹

This means that the passage has to be understood against the background of Jewish Hellenistic traditions.

Finally we must consider the end of the passage where it is said that Jesus is brought to the high mountain called Thabor. The oldest known passage in Christian literature about Mount Thabor is found in Origen's writings in which it is said that the transfiguration occurred on that place.²² On the other hand Epiphanius writes that "many" assume that the temptation happened on this mountain.²³ This again makes it impossible to draw definite conclusions about the context of the present passage. We have already noted that it is not strictly necessary to suppose that the present quotation refers to any of these events, because Mount Thabor plays a prominent part in various traditions both in the Old Testament and in early Christian literature.²⁴

¹⁹ See W. Boussel, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, *FRLANT* 10 (Göttingen 1907) 66ff.

²⁰ *Dem.* XVIII, ed. I. Parisot, *Patrologia Syriaca* I/1 (Parisii 1894) 839-840.

²¹ Lipsius-Bonnet, *Acta Apost. Apokr.* II/2, c.7, 110,19-20; c.39, 157,16-17; c.27, 142,15-16 and c.50, 166,13.

²² Origen, *Selecta in Ps.* 88, Migne, *PG* 12, 1548D: Θαβώρ δέ ἐστι τὸ ὅρος τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐφ ὅμι μεμορφώθη Χριστός, cf. J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims. Before the Crusades* (Warminster 1977) 173: "The New Testament does not tell us on which mountain the Lord was transfigured, but the Pilgrims of our period unanimously accept the belief that it was on Thabor."

²³ Epiphanius, *Panarion* LI 7, ed. Holl, Epiphanius II, *GCS* (Leipzig 1922) 279,17-18: ...ἀνενεχθῆναι εἰς ὅρος ὑψηλὸν λίον (cf. Matth. 4,1) ὅπερ πορὰ πολλοῖς λέγεται εἶναι τὸ Θαβώρ ὅρος...

²⁴ In N.T. Ms. 1424 it is said in a marginal gloss to Matth. 28,16 that Jesus appeared to his disciples after the resurrection εἰς τὸ Θαβώρ, cf. also H. J. Kraus, *Die Kulttraditionen des Berges Thabor. Eine alttestamentliche Studie*, *Basileia*, Walter Freytag zum 60. Geburtstag. Herausgegeben von J. Hermelink und B. J. Margull (Stuttgart 1959, 1961²); Clemens Kopp, *Die heiligen Stätten der Evangelien* (Regensburg 1959) 299-306, and P. W. L. Walker *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* (Oxford 1990) 145-155.

III

Origen, *Comment. in Matthaeum* XV 14

ed. E. Benz-E. Klostermann, *Matthäuserklärung, GCS, Origenes* X 1 (Leipzig 1935) and X 2 (Leipzig 1937) 389-390

after 244 (this part of unknown date)

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoreans

scriptum est in evangelio quodam, quod dicitur secundum Hebraeos (si tamen placet alicui suspicere illud, non ad auctoritatem sed ad manifestationem propositae quaestionis):

Dixit, inquit ad eum alter divitum:

Magister, quid bonum faciens vivam?

Dixit ei: Homo, legem et prophetas fac.

Respondit ad eum: Feci.

Dixit ei: Vade, vende omnia quae possides et divide pauperibus, et veni, sequere me.

Coepit autem dives scalpere caput suum et non placuit ei.

Et dicit ad eum dominus: Quomodo dicis: Feci legem et prophetas? Quoniam scriptum est in lege:

Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum,

et ecce multi fratres tui filii Abrahae amicti sunt stercore, morientes praefame, et domus tua plena est multis bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ex ea ad eos.

Et conversus dixit Simoni discipulo suo sedenti apud se:

Simon, fili Iona, facilius est camelum intrare per foramen acus quam divitem in regnum coelorum.

It is written in a certain Gospel which is called according to the Hebrews (if, however, it pleases somebody to accept it, not as authority but in order to bring to light the question which has been put): Another of the rich men, it says, said to him: Master, what good must I do to live? He said to him: Man, do the law and the prophets. He answered him: I did. He said to him: Go, sell all that you possess and divide it among the poor and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him: Is it not written in the law: Love your neighbour as yourself? And see, many of your brothers, sons of Abraham, are covered with dung, dying from hunger, and your house is filled with many good things, and absolutely nothing goes out of it to them. And he turned to Simon his disciple who sat with him and said to him: Simon, son of Jona, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man into the kingdom of heaven.

Commentary

The passage can be compared to Matthew 19,16-24/Mark 10,17-25 and Luke 18,18-25. It can be divided into the following parts:

- Dixit, inquit...prophetas fac*, cf. Matth. 19,16-17/Mark 10,17-18/Luke 18,18-25.
- Respondit ad eum...non placuit ei*, cf. Matth. 19,20-21/Mark 10,20-21/Luke 18,21-22.
- Et dicit...ad eos*, cf. Matth. 19,19.
- Et conversus...coelorum*, cf. Matth. 19,23-24/Mark 10,23-25/Luke 18,24-25.

The four parts will be dealt with separately.²⁵

a. *Dixit, inquit...prophetas fac*. The beginning of the passage differs from the text in the synoptic Gospels. In Matth. 19,16 we read: καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰς προσελθών αὐτῷ εἶπεν, in Mark 10,17: καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν προσδραμῶν εἰς καὶ γονιπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν and Luke 18,18: καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων λέγων. On the other hand, the quotation agrees with Matthew in using the word *dixit* instead of ἐπηρώτα or ἐπηρώτησεν which is found in the other two Gospels. None of the synoptic Gospels speaks of a "rich" man, although Luke reads ἄρχων. However, in Mark 10,17 a number of manuscripts such as A K M W Θ f.13 georg syhmg arm and sa add the word πλούσιος which is also found in Ephrem's Commentary on the Diatessaron²⁶ and in Aphraates.²⁷ The passage speaks of an *alter divitum*. It seems that there has been earlier reference to a rich man. This would agree with the Diatessaron in which according to the text of Liège and the Arabic version Luke 12,13-21 precedes the present quotation and Luke 16,14-15 follows on from it. This would mean that the Diatessaron gives three passages about rich men one after the other.

Instead of *quid bonum faciens vivam* as in the present passage we read in Matthew: διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἡνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, in Mark: διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἡνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω and in Luke: διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζ.α. κληρονομήσω. This means that in contrast to the synoptic Gospels, the word αἰώνιον is missing. This is similar to Ephrem who reads *quid faciam ut vivam*. The passage also agrees with Matthew where only the word *magister* is found. On the other hand the word *faciens* seems to agree with the Lukan reading *ποιήσας* which is also found in Matthew in the manuscripts X L 28 33 157, while in Luke the word ποῶν is found in the manuscripts 1 131 209 a aur d f vg.

²⁵ See A. F. J. Klijn, The Question of the Rich Young Man in a Jewish Christian Gospel, *Nov. Test.* 8 (1966) 149-155. J. W. Wenham, Why do you ask me about the good? A Study of the Relation between Text and Source Criticism, *NTS* 28 (1982) 116-125, was not very helpful on this commentary.

²⁶ ed. L. Leloir, *Saint Ephrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant...*, *Chester Beatty Monographs* 8 (Dublin 1963) 139-145.

²⁷ *Dem. XX 18*, ed. I. Parisot, *Patrologia Syriaca* I/1 (Parisii 1894) 927-928. All further references to Ephrem and Aphraates in the commentary on this passage can be found on the pages mentioned in this and the previous note.

The quotation omits the discussion about what or who is good. Nor is there talk of the specific commandments which have to be kept. We can compare the words *Dixit ei: Homo legem et prophetas fac* to the introduction to the words about the various commandments which read in Matthew: τίρησον τὰς ἐντολὰς and in Mark and Luke: τὰς ἐντολὰς οἴδας.

b. *Respondit ad eum...non placuit ei.* The beginning of the second part can be compared to Matthew: λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος· πάντα ταῦτα ἐφύλαξα, Mark: ὃ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφύλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητος μου and Luke: ὃ δὲ εἶπον· ταῦτα πάντα ἐφύλαξα ἐκ νεότητος. The word *responditis* is found in some manuscripts of Mark 10,21, where K A D f.1 f.13 sy^sP read ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν instead of ἔφη, C ἀποκριθεὶς ἔφη, and b c f *respondit ait*, and a ff² q k *respondit dixit*. The word *feci* in place of ἐφύλαξα(μην) which is found in the three synoptic Gospels, is met in Mark 10,20 in f.1 565 sy^s georg arm Ephrem and Aphraates.

Jesus' answer is shorter in the present quotation because it lacks the promise of a treasure in heaven. The words *omnis quae possides* deviate from those in Matthew which reads *σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα*, but can be compared to Mark: *ὅσα ἔχεις* and Luke: *πάντα.ὅσα ἔχεις*. However, in Matthew 19,21 the manuscripts f ff² sy^s also read *omnia quae possides*. The word *divide* is different from the words *δὸς* in Matthew and Mark and *διάδος* in Luke, but Mark 10,21 reads *distribute* in k, *divide* in a and f.13. Since the quotation is shorter than the passages in the synoptic Gospels, we wonder whether the omission of the words *καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς* in the text of sy^s of Matthew and with Aphraates has any special significance.

In this quotation the man reacts quite differently from the way he does in the synoptic Gospels. In the synoptic Gospels he is supposed to be sad but according to the present passage he does not like Jesus' words.

c. *Et dicit...ad eos.* The text deviates from that of the synoptic Gospels. In the Jewish-Christian Gospel the words *Diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum* are not an integral part of the commandments which were kept by the man but they are supposed to be an additional commandment which the man had overlooked. The presence of these words in this position is more appropriate than their position in the passage in Matthew.²⁸

Jesus gives a vivid picture of the *multi fratres* who live in poverty. The presence of the word *fratres* shows that the author of this Gospel was writing for a small group.²⁹

d. *Et conversus...coelorum.* In the synoptic Gospels a new pericope begins here which in Matthew and Mark is only loosely connected with the preceding

²⁸ It is striking that in Des Petrus von Laodicea Erklärung des Matthäusevangelium, ed. G. Heinrici, *Beiträge z. Gesch. u. Erkl. des N.T.* V (Leipzig 1908) 216, after the question τι ἔτι ὑστερῶ (cf. Matth.. 19,20) follows ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον... (vs. 19).

²⁹ According to H. J. Schoeps, Review J. Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte...* (Gütersloh 1951), *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 72 (1951) 289-291, the passage refers to the miserable situation of the Jews who after the destruction of the temple A.D. 70 were living East of the River Jordan.

one. Luke connected the two stories. According to Matthew and Mark, Jesus is speaking to the disciples and according to Luke to the man. However, in this passage matters are quite different: Jesus is addressing *Simon, filius Ionaee*.

We can say the following about this name. In Matth. 16,17 we find the double name Σίμων Βαριωνά which is, however, read in the manuscripts L Γ f.1 f.13 28 565 and other ones as Βαρ 'Ιωνᾶ. The manuscripts sy^{s(c)p} render this name as Σίμων ουιός. The word ουιός means "son".

In John 1,42 we meet the name Σίμων ουιός 'Ιωάννου and in 21,15.16 and 17 Σίμων 'Ιωάννου. On the other hand, we find in Joh 1,42 in the manuscripts K f1 f.13 the word 'Ιωνᾶ and in sy^{s(c)p} Σίμων ουιός. This again agrees with the Old-Latin manuscript q which reads *Ionaee* and c vg^{odd} which has *Iona*. The same happens in John 21,15.16 and 17 where the manuscripts K Θ f.1 f.13 and some others read 'Ιωνᾶ, sy^p reads Σίμων ουιός, sy^s Σίμων ουιός and the Old-Latin *Bariona*.

One can question whether the word *Iona* is the original form and John the secondary form. It appears that the word ΙΩΝΗ cannot be found in Jewish sources before the fourth century. We also see that in the LXX the words 'Ιωνᾶ and 'Ιωνας are often used to render the Hebrew names יְהוֹנָה or יְהוֹנָתָן (cf. 2 Kings 23,23 in B; 1 Kings 26,3 in A and B; 1 Ezra 9,1 (= Ezra 10,6 in B and 9,23 in A and B). It would appear that 'Ιωνᾶ is a Septuagintism. We may, therefore, conclude that the name ουιός 'Ιωάννου in John 1,42 gives a better rendering of the Hebrew or Aramaic form of this name than *Iona* and the like. If this is correct we can only say that the name in the present quotation has to be explained on the basis of a Greek text.³⁰

The final words can be compared to Matth. 19,14/Mark 10,25/Luke 10,25. The synoptic Gospels read εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ in place of *regnum coelorum*, but the manuscripts Z f.1 33 ff¹ and sy^{sc} in Matthew agree with the quotation, as does Mark according to sy^s. The position of *intrare* before *per foramen...* agrees with sy^{sc} in Luke 18,25 and Matth. 19,24 and with sy^s in Mark 10,25. The same is found in Aphraates.

About the relation between the present quotation and the synoptic tradition the following can be said.

In the New Testament the text of Matthew and Luke depend on Mark, but each of them have their own peculiarities some of which agree with our passage. The words διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθόν instead of διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί can be found in Mark and Luke. The commandment about loving one's neighbour is also present in Matthew. Matthew and our quotation omit the words ἐκ νεότητός (μου) which are present in Mark and Luke. But on the other hand we see that Matth. 19,20 uses the word νεανίσκος which is absent in Mark, Luke and our quotation. This must be sufficient evidence to conclude that the quotation cannot depend upon Matthew. It is based upon an independent

³⁰ See Jeremias, s.v. 'Ιωνᾶ, *Theol. Wörterb. z.N.T.* III 410, and H. Hirschberg, *Simon Bariona and the Ebionites*, *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* 61 (1942) 171-191.

tradition of this story which must, however, have been also known to the author of Matthew.

This, however, only applies to the accepted text. We have seen, however, that the quotation often agrees with particular variant readings in the manuscripts of the Greek text and the versions. We cannot exclude possibility that these variant readings were ultimately the result of the influence of the same independent tradition known to the writer of the Jewish-Christian Gospel. We can add that these variant readings can be particularly found in a group of manuscripts which is commonly called "Caesarean", like f.1 and f.13, and the Syriac tradition represented by the Diatessaron, the Old-Syriac translation, Aphraates and Ephrem. It is not surprising that we sometimes came across this group in the company of the Old-Latin text.³¹

The theological background of this passage betrays itself in its use of the word *fratres*. This means that the quotation originated within a small group of people who must have had a Jewish background.

IV

Eusebius, *De Theophania*

ed. Migne, PG 24 (Parisiis 1857) 685-688
after 323

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoreans

έπει δὲ τὸ εἰς τὴν ἕπον 'Εβραϊκοῖς χαρακήρωις εὐαγγέλιον τὴν ἀπειλὴν οὐ κατὰ τοῦ ἀποκρύψαντος ἐπῆγεν, ὅλλα κατὰ τοῦ ἀσώτως ἔζηκότος. Τρεῖς γὰρ δούλους περιεῖχε, τὸν μὲν καταφαγόντα τὴν ὑπαρξιν τοῦ δεσπότου μετὰ ποριῶν καὶ αὐλήτριῶν, τὸν δὲ πολλάπλασιάσαντα τὴν ἐργασίαν, τὸν δὲ κατακρύψαντα τὸ τάλαντον· εἴτα τὸν μὲν ἀποδεχθῆναι, τὸν δὲ μεμφθῆναι, μόνον τὸν δὲ συγκλεισθῆναι δεσμωτηριώ. 'Εφίστημι, μήποτε κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον μετὰ τὴν συμπλήρωσιν τοῦ λόγου τὴν κατὰ τοῦ μηδὲν ἐργασαμένου ἡ ἔξῆς ἐπιλεγομένη ἀπειλὴ οὐ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅλλα περὶ τοῦ προτέρου κατ' ἐπανάληψιν λέλεκται τοῦ ἐσθίοντος καὶ πίνοντος μετὰ τῶν μεθυόντων.

Since the Gospel which has come to us in Hebrew letters directs its threat not against the one who has hidden (his talent) but against the one who lived in extravagance (for he possessed three slaves, one who spent the fortune of his master with harlots and flute-girls, the second who multiplied his trade and the third who hid his talent; next the first was accepted, the second rebuked only,

³¹ See B. M. Metzger, The Caesarean Text of the Gospels, Chapters in the History of the New Testament Textual Criticism, *New Testament Tools and Studies* IV (Leiden 1963) 42-72.

the third, however, was thrown into prison) I wonder whether the threat in Matthew which, according to the letter was spoken against the one who did nothing, applies not to him but to the first one who was eating and drinking with those who were drunken, by way of resumption.

Commentary

Eusebius does not give a literal quotation from the Gospel "in Hebrew letters". He simply compares the text of the Parable of the Talents in Matth. 25,14-30 with the text found in the Gospel he has discovered and he comes to the conclusion that some differences exist. The most important of these is that it was not he who hid the talent who was threatened but he who lived in dissipation. After this he sums up what the three slaves have done. One spent the fortune of his master on harlots and flute-players,³² the second multiplied his trade and the third hid his talent. This is the order given by Eusebius because he wanted to show the emphasis which has been laid upon the slave living in prodigality. At the end of the present passage he seems to present the original order of the parable. Here it is said that the first was accepted. This must have been the slave who multiplied his trade. The second one was merely rebuked. This must have been the slave who hid his talent. The third one was thrown into prison and this must have been the one who squandered his money.

Some parts of the Matthew parable can still be recognized. In both parables there is mention of somebody who multiplied the talents of his master and someone else who hid his talent. Matthew, however, speaks of two slaves who multiplied their talents. Therefore, Eusebius is likely to have read a similar parable in which there was talk of somebody who frittered away his master's money. It is the introduction of this idea which makes the parable different from that in Matthew. The Matthew parable deals with Jesus' second coming after which Christians will be asked what they done with what they have been entrusted with. The worst crime is that somebody should hide his talent which means that he has done nothing with it. In other words "talents" may not be hidden. In the parable cited by Eusebius we notice what is called by Jeremias "eine moralisierende Vergröberung".³³ A Christian is no longer primarily expected to be active but he has to live a decent life. In this way the sociological background of this Parable would seem to reveal a small group of introspective Christians who are avoiding being contaminated by the outside world instead of going to reveal their "talents".

It is difficult to decide whether the author of the Jewish-Christian Gospel was acquainted with Matthew. It seems that the present version of the parable is secondary compared to the Matthew version or to the source of this Gospel.

³² See for "whores and flute-players" W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch z. N.T.*⁵, 241.

³³ See J. Jeremias, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen 1954³) 56.

We wonder whether the sentence τὸν μὲν καταφαγόντα τὴν ὑπαρξιν τοῦ δεσπότου μέτα πορνῶν καὶ αὐλήτριδων does not show the influence of Luke 15,30, where it is said : ὁ καταφαγών σου τὸν βίον³⁴ μετὰ πορνῶν. If this were so the author of the Gospel might also be held to be dependent upon Luke. But it is also possible that the expression used in this case is a common place.

v

Eusebius, *Theophania syriaca* IV 12

ed. Samuel Lee, *Eusebius, Bishop of Ceasarea on the Theophania or Divine Manifestation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. A Syriac Version. Edited from an Ancient Manuscript recently discovered (London 1842)*
after 222

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoracans

Then he taught about the divisions of the souls which will come about in the houses, as we have found somewhere in the Gospel which exists among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which it is said: I choose for myself the good ones, the good ones whom my Father in heaven has given to me.

Commentary

Eusebius is obviously giving a literal quotation after a short introduction. A few lines later he comes back to the reference in the following way:  . The text is the same apart from the word  which is missing. This may be a denominative pronoun but can also be used to translate the Greek article.³⁵ This means that the omission has no relevance for the meaning of the passage.

³⁴ In *sy^{pc}ophil* the word *βιον* of Luke 15,12 and 30 has been rendered by *καταλογός* which in turn is a translation of the word *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* in *sy^{pc}ophil* in Luke 8,3, in *sy^{pphil}* in 12,33 in *sy^{ps}* in Matth. 25,14 and in *sy^{pc}* in Matth. 19,21.

³⁵ See Th. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1898, Nachdruck Darmstadt 1966) 173, par. 228. In the Greek original one should expect the word τοῦτο.

The passage quoted above is found in a part of *Theophaneia*, Book IV, that is introduced by the words "Concerning the Divisions of the Houses and the Families which exist until the present Day because of the Doctrine. From the Gospel of Matthew". Eusebius quotes Matth. 10,34-36/Luke 12,51-53 which speaks of the divisions brought about by Jesus within certain families. The "Hebrew Gospel" is quoted by Eusebius because it gives the reason for these divisions.

The introduction does not present many difficulties and reads: "Then he taught about the divisions³⁶ of the souls which will come about in the houses, as we have found somewhere in the Gospel that exists among the Jews in the Hebrew language in which it is said".

Next Eusebius gives the quotation proper. The text has been variously interpreted and, therefore, we should consider the text again. Lee, the first editor of this text, gave the following translation: "I will select to myself these things, very very excellent are those who my Father, who is in heaven, has given to me".³⁷ Lee obviously assumed that **things**, these things, is *femin. plural* of the demonstrative **things** which makes it impossible to connect this word with **things**.³⁸ However, the word appears to be a translation of the Greek *τοὺς* as we saw above. Next Lee believed that the repetition of **things** emphasizes this word and he translated this as "the very excellent" but this is unusual in Syriac because in this language such a repetition has a distributive meaning.

Resch gave the following rendering: *Eligam mihi bonos, quos pater meus coelestis mihi dedit*.³⁹ He ignored the second **things**. The same translation is found in Schmidtke: "Ich wählte mir die Guten aus, die mir mein Vater im Himmel gegeben hat".⁴⁰ Gressmann was right saying that the words

things have to be taken into account in some way.⁴¹ He chose the distributive repetition and translated as follows: "Ich wählte mich je die Besten mir aus, die mir mein Vater im Himmel gibt". Vielhauer again deviated from this translation and rendered: "Ich wählte mir die Würdigsten aus, die Würdigsten sind die, die mir mein Vater im Himmel gegeben hat".⁴² This is also incorrect because **things** is not a *copula*, but a demonstrative which belongs to **things**. It is also a mistake to render the word **things** as a perfect. It has to be translated by "Ich wähle" or probably by "I shall choose".

³⁶ The word **things**, divisions, is given in the plural which means that the word **things**, being *femin. sing.* is not to be connected with **things**, the cause. The passage, therefore, does not refer to the divisions of the souls, cf. H. Gressmann, *Die Theophanie*, GCS, Eusebius III (Leipzig 1904) 183, and Vielhauer, in: Hennecke-Schneemelcher I³, 98, but to their cause.

³⁷ S. Lee, *Eusebius...on the Theophaneia...* (London 1842) 233-234.

³⁸ See C. Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1951) 50, par.85.

³⁹ A. Resch, *Agrapha* 220.

⁴⁰ Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* 34.

⁴¹ Gressmann, *Die Theophanie...*, 183.

⁴² in: Hennecke-Schneemelcher I³, 98.

We return now to the repetition ~~καὶ~~ ~~καὶ~~. We can assume that the second part of the sentence goes into details of the meaning of the first part. In the first part it is said that Jesus will choose ~~καὶ~~ and in the second we see that these are exclusively these people "who my Father in heaven has given to me".

The translation of ~~καὶ~~ seems to be difficult, because we find translations like "excellent" (Lee), *bonos* or "die Guten" (Resch and Schmidke), "die Besten" (Gressmann) and "die Würdigsten" (Vielhauer). The Greek original obviously used the words $\tauούς$ καλούς· οἱ καλοί. In this context we assume the word καλός to mean "(morally) good" or "irreproachable". If we have to suppose that this Greek original is a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic original we can be certain that the word **בָּן** was used.

This means that the emphasis is on the nature of those "good ones" who have been given to Jesus by the Father.

Now we shall look at the context of this reference. We start from the passage in Matth. 10,34-36/Luke 12,51-53 about the divisions of families arising from the fact that Jesus has chosen some individuals to follow him. Similar ideas can be found elsewhere in the New Testament (cf. Luke 6,13; Acts 1,2; John 6,70). In the quotation considered here it is also said that those chosen by Jesus have been given to him by the Father which seems to be a typically Johannine idea (cf. John 17,2, 6, 9, 24 and 18,9). It must have been introduced by people who felt themselves to be specially chosen and thus separated from the material world.⁴³

The word "good ones" is not unknown in the New Testament. We meet this word in Matth. 5,45 and 22,10. In Matth. 12,35/Luke 6,45 we read about a good man who produces good things out of a good treasure. Matth. 25,21-12/Luke 19,17 speaks of a good and faithful servant and Luke 23,50 of being good and righteous. In Acts 11,24 it is said that Barnabas is "good". In the Apostolic Fathers the word is found several times. According to Didache 5,2, Barnabas 4,12 and *Pastor Hermae* 72,6; 73,4-5 and 76,1-2 Christians are "good". In all passages we can assume that the idea "morally good" is to be supposed. Special importance is to be attached to the passage in Ps. Clement, *Hom. VII* 22 4 and XI 29 3, which speaks of the "good ones" with no other meaning than that of "Christians".⁴⁴

⁴³ See R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannes-Evangelium 3, Herders Theol. Kommentar z.N.T.* (Freiburg 1975) 195: "Ohne dass die Prädestination thematisiert wird verrät Joh 17 doch ein starkes Erwählungsbewusstsein, das sich in einer 'esoterischen' Gemeinde gebildet haben könnte".

⁴⁴ See H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums* (Tübingen 1949) 280-281. In Ps. Clement, *Hom VII* 22 4, ed. Rehm-Irmscher-Paschke, 130, it is said that one is invited to put on a pure wedding garment which is baptism and $\tauούς$ ἀγαθούς εἰς τὸ θεοῦ δεῖπνον εἰσάγειν εἰς τὴν μεταμελεῖον. In Ps. Clement, *Hom.XI* 29 3, ed. Rehm-Irmscher-Paschke, 168-169, the text refers to Matth. 13,25 after which follows: φωτισθέντος γὰρ τοῦ ιοῦ τῇ γυνώσει διαθῶν δύναται ἀγαθὸς εἶναι φορέπεται τὸ καθόρου γενέσθαι.

We may conclude that this passage wishes to express the idea that Christians are something special because they have been chosen by God. This means that a sharp division exists between them and the other people. This again explains why families were split up once a member became a Christian.

VI

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 13 2-3

ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus und Panarion Haer* 1-33, GCS, Epiphanius I (Leipzig 1915) 349,1-350,2
ca. 375

Source: Gospel according to the Ebionites

'Ἐν τῷ γοῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὄνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νεονθευμένῳ καὶ ἡκρωτηριασμένῳ, 'Ἐβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν, ἐμφέρεται διτὶ ἐγένετο τις ἀνὴρ ὄνόματι 'Ιησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, δις ἐξελέξατο ημᾶς. Καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναούμι εισῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰπεν· παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος ἐξελεξάμην 'Ιωάννην καὶ 'Ιάκωβον, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμωνα καὶ 'Ανδρέαν καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν ζηλωτὴν καὶ 'Ιούδαν τὸν 'Ισκαριώτην (MS M om. καὶ τὸν 'Ισκ.), καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα καὶ ἡκολούθησάς μοι (MS M μου). 'Υμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύο ὀποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ 'Ισραήλ.

The Gospel which is called with them according to Matthew which is not complete but falsified and distorted, they call it the Hebrew Gospel and in it can be found: There was a man called Jesus, about thirty years old, who chose us. And he came to Caphernaum, he entered the house of Simon, also called Peter, and opened his mouth and said: When I went by the sea of Tiberias I chose John and James, the sons of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew and Thaddaeus and Simon the Zealot and Judas the Iskariot and you Matthew, who was sitting at the custom-house; I called and you followed me. I wish you to be twelve apostles for the testimony to Israel.

Commentary

First we have to investigate the relation between this quotation and the text of the canonical Gospels.

The expression ἐγένετο τις ἀνὴρ ὄνόματι 'Ιησοῦς is typically Lucan, cf. 1,5: 'Ἐγένετο...τις ὄνόματι Ζαχαρίας.

ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, cf. Luke 3,23, but the word ὡς in place of ὡσεὶ in Luke is only found in the manuscripts D 13 69 788 and a few others.

δος ἔξελέξατο ἡμᾶς, cf. Luke 6,13; John 6,70 and Acts 1,2.

καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναούμ, cf. Luke 4,31, but ...κατῆλθεν.

εἰσῆλθεν...Πέτρου, Luke 4,38: εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος; Matth. 8,14: καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Π. and Mark 1,29: ...ῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος.

The expression τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου is typical of Acts, cf. 10,5.18.32 and 11,13.

ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, cf. Matth. 5,2; 17,37 and Luke 1,64.

παρερχόμενος, cf. Mark 1,6 and Matth. 1,18.

παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος. The word λίμνη in this context is found in Luke 5,1 only. The name Tiberias in connection with the lake in John 6,1.23 and 21,1 only.

'Ιωάννην καὶ...καὶ Σίμωνα, cf. Mark 1,19 and 3,16. In the lists of the apostles, cf. Mark 3,16-18/Matth.10,2-4/Luke 6,14-16 and Acts 1,12, we find Simon, Andrew, James and John but in Acts: Peter, John, James and Andrew.

Θαδδαῖον...τὸν Ἰσκαρώπην, cf. the end of the list, mentioned above in Mark 3,18-19/Matth.10,3-4/Luke 6,15-16, but Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον ζηλωτὴν in Luke 6,15 and Ἰσκαρώθ in Mark 3,19.

Καὶ σε τὸν...τοῦ τελωνίου, cf. Matth. 9,9/Mark 2,14/Luke 5,27, but Λευίν in Mark and Luke and ἐπὶ τοῦ in place of ἐπὶ τῷ in Mark in manuscript W only.

ἐκάλεσα καὶ ἡκολούθησάς μοι, cf. Math. 9,9/Mark 2,10/Luke 5,27.

εἶναι δεκαδύο ἀποστόλους, Matth.10.1-2/Mark 3,14/Luke 6,13.

εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, cf. Matth. 19,28/Luke 18,30, but here one does find the idea of judging Israel. In Barnabas 8,3 it is said that the disciples are εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν φυλῶν (*scil.* of Israel). See for the expression εἰς μαρτύριον Mark 1,44/Matth. 8,4/Luke 5,14; Mark 6,12/Matth. 10,18/Luke 9,5; Mark 13,9/Matth. 24,18.

This is the first of a number of quotations which are supposed to have been quoted by Epiphanius from the "Gospel according to the Ebionites". It is not clear why he took this as the first one since it is hardly a good example of a Gospel which is "not complete, but falsified and distorted". The only reason for choosing this as the first one seems to be that from this quotation it can be concluded that the Gospel really was that of Matthew. But on the other hand, it is also possible to say that the Gospel was thought of as that of the Twelve Apostles since Jesus spoke to "us".⁴⁵

The quotation is a composite of words, expressions and phrases from the synoptic Gospels. A slight preference for Luke emerges.

It is doubtful whether Epiphanius quoted word for word. Something may be missing after the words ἔξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. If this conclusion is wrong we have to assume that the first sentence is an introduction to the rest. It is also questionable whether he quoted the names of all the apostles who are

⁴⁵ See p. 28.

mentioned in this Gospel. He seems to give the first and the last four out of an original list of twelve.

It is important that the apostles are held to be witnesses to Israel. According to Matth. 19,28/Luke 18,30 the apostles will judge the tribes of Israel. The present quotation agrees with a passage in the Letter of Barnabas 8,3 which also appears to represent a tradition of Jewish-Christian origin.

VII

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 13 4-5

ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus...*, 350,2-7
ca. 375

Source: The Gospel according to the Ebionites

έγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἶχεν δὲ Ἰωάννης ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ, φησί, μέλι ἄγριον, οὐδὲ γεῦσις ἡ τοῦ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρίς ἐν ἐλαῖῳ· ἵνα δῆθεν μεταστρέψωσι τὸν τῆς ὀληθείας λόγου εἰς ψεῦδος καὶ ἀντὶ ἀκριδῶν ποιήσωσιν ἐγκρίδι ἐν μέλιτι.

It happened that John baptized and the Pharisees went out to him and were baptized and all Jerusalem. And John was dressed in a mantle of camel's hair and a leather belt was round his waist. And his food was, it said, wild honey, of which the taste was that of manna, like cakes in olive oil. They say this to turn the word of truth into a lie and they say honey-cakes instead of locusts.

Commentary

A comparison with the parallel passages in the canonical Gospels gives the following result:

έγένετο...βαπτίζων, cf. Mark 1,4.

καὶ ἐξῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖοι, cf. Matth. 3,7, but with the addition of Σαδδουκαῖοι.

καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα, cf. Mark 1,5: Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία.

εἶχεν...καμήλου, cf. Matth. 3,4.

καὶ ζώνην...όσφυν αὐτοῦ, cf. Matth. 3,4.

καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ μέλι ἄγριον, cf. Matth. 3,4, but here the word τροφή is used.

οὐδὲ γεῦσις...ἐλαῖῳ, cf. Num. 11,8: καὶ ἦν ἡ ἤδουντα αὐτοῦ (scil. mannah) ὡσεὶ γεῦμα ἐγκρίς ἐξ ἐλαίου and Ex. 16,31: τὸ δε γεῦμα αὐτοῦ (scil. mannah) ὡς ἐγκρίς ἐν μέλιτι.

This passage is also a composite of words and phrases that have been taken from the canonical Gospels. It is evident that Epiphanius quoted this passage as part of his attempt to show that the Gospel is “falsified and distorted”. This is supposed to be already proven from the alteration of the word ἀγκρίδες into ἔγκρις. This also appears to be the most important part of the quotation. John the Baptist is supposed to have followed a vegetarian life-style.⁴⁶

It is important that the quotation shows the influence of the LXX. This and the word-play with regard to ἔγκρις and ἀκρίδες definitely shows that we are dealing with an original Greek work.

VIII

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 13 6

ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus...*, 350,7-12
ca. 375

Source: Gospel according to the Ebionites

Ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίου ἔχει ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἥλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, δις ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ, καὶ ἐξῆρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες.

The beginning of the Gospel among them reads: It happened in the days of Herod the king of Judea that John came, baptizing with the baptism of conversion in the river Jordan. Of him it is said that he was from the family of Aaron the priest, the son of Zacharias and Elisabeth. And all went out to him.

Parallel Text

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 14 3

ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus...*, 351,12-17
ca. 375

Παρακόψαντες γὰρ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογίας ἀρχονται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι ὡς προείπομεν, λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγένετο, φησίν, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα, ἥλθεν τις Ἰωάννης ὀνόματι βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

⁴⁶ See S. Brock, The Baptist's Diet in Syriac Sources, *Oriens Christianus* 54 (1970) 113-124.

For they have removed the genealogies of Matthew and begin, as we said before, with the words: It happened, they say, in the days of Herod the king of Judea, when Caiaphas was high priest that a certain man called John, who baptized with the baptism of conversion in the river Jordan, etc.

Commentary

Both quotations give the same passage from the "Gospel according to the Ebionites". The second one is shorter than the first one. The reason for this is that Epiphanius intends to show in the second quotation that the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew is absent in the Ebionite Gospel. For all other aspects he can refer to the passage quoted earlier. On the other hand we see that the first and longer passage lacks a few words which can be found in the second quotation. These are the words *ἐπὶ ὄρχιερέως Καίάφα* after 'Ιουδαίας, the word *τις* before 'Ιωάννης and the word *ὄνόματι* after 'Ιωάννης. It is difficult to decide whether Epiphanius omitted words from the first quotation or added them to the second quotation. We would suggest that the second passage is more faithful to the original text because here Epiphanius seems to have had the text of the Gospel before him as is apparent from the words *etcetera* at the end of the passage. This would mean that he is aware that the text continues. However, we must admit that this argument is not very strong. Nevertheless we shall start from the longer text in order to compare this quotation with the text of the canonical Gospels.

ἐγένετο ἐν...τις 'Ιουδαίας, cf. Luke 1,5.

ἐπὶ ὄρχιερέως Καίάφα, cf. Luke 3,2, but here: "Αυνα καὶ Καίάφα.

ἥλθεν τις 'Ιωάννης ὄνόματι, cf. for the connection of the date and the appearance of John the Baptist Luke 3,1-4.

βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας, cf. Mark 1,4/Luke 3,3; Acts 13,24 and 19,4, but with the verb κίρυσσω, apart from Acts 13,24.

ἐν τῷ Ιορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, cf. Mark 1,5/Matth. 3,6.

ὅς ἐλέγετο ἐκ γένους 'Ααρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως. According to Luke 1,5 Elisabeth is one of "the daughters of Aaron".

παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ, cf. Luke 1,5.

καὶ ἐξίρχοντο...πάντες, cf. Mark 1,5/Matth. 3,5.

The influence of the Gospel of Luke is considerable. Luke, however, does not say that John the Baptist is from the family of Aaron. This is not completely unknown from other sources because in the Commentary of Ephrem on the Diatessaron it is said that Jesus received the priesthood of the house of Levi because of his "second birth which was bestowed upon him by the son of Aaron".⁴⁷

⁴⁷ ed. L. Leloir, *Éphrem de Nisibe, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant ou Diatessaron, Sourc. Chét.* 121 (Paris 1966) 94-95 (Armenian Text).

On the other hand the quotation is striking for what it omits to say. The words εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν have been left out after μετανοίας, cf. Mark 1,4/Matth. 3,3. Nothing is said about “the desert” in which John the Baptist preached according to the canonical Gospel, cf. Matth. 3,1/Mark 1,4/Luke 3,2. We wonder whether these elements were deliberately omitted by the author of the present Gospel or whether Epiphanius was merely summarising its text.

IX

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 13 7-8

ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus...*, 350,12-351,6
ca. 375

Source: Gospel according to the Ebionites

Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ ἐπιφέρει ὅτι τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἐλθεν καὶ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. Καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος, ἦνοιγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ εἶδεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς, κατελθούστης καὶ εἰσελθούστης εἰς αὐτὸν. Καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα· σύ μου εἰ ὁ υἱός ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ τὸ δόκησα, καὶ πάλιν· ἔγώ σήμερον γεγένυτα σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπου φῶς μέγα. “Οἱ δών, φησίν, ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ τίς εἶ, κύριε (om. MS. M); Καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐφ' ὃν πρόδοκησα. Καὶ τότε, φησίν, ὁ Ἰωάννης προσπεσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν· Δέομαί σου, κύριε σύ με βάπτισον. ‘Ο δὲ ἐκάλυσεν αὐτὸν λέγων· Ἀφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶν πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα.

And after much is said in the Gospel it continues: After the people has been baptized Jesus also came and was baptized by John. And when he ascended from the water the heavens opened and he saw the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove descending and coming to him. And a voice from heaven said: Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased, and next: This day I have generated thee. And suddenly a great light shone about that place. When John saw it, they say, he said to him: Who art thou Lord? And again a voice came from heaven which said to him: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. After this, it says, John fell down before him and said: I pray thee, Lord, baptize thou me. But he withstood him and said: Let it be, since so it is necessary that everything will be fulfilled.

Commentary

The words μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ are not clear. Epiphanius quotes a passage which must have been part of the beginning of the “Gospel according to the Ebionites”. But we wonder what was said before the story of Jesus’ baptism. In

the Gospels of Matthew and Luke something is said about the preaching of John the Baptist but this is no more than a short story, cf. Matth. 3,7-12/Luke 3,7-20. We can only conclude that the introduction must remain a mystery. The following can be said about the contents of the quotation.

τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος, cf. Luke 3,21.

ἡλθον καὶ Ἰησοῦς, cf. Mark 1,9

καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, cf. Mark 1,9 but: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἑκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθον Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου.

καὶ ὡς...ύδοτος, cf. Mark 1,10/Matth. 3,16, but: εὐθὺς ἀνέβη ἀπὸ...

· ἡνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, cf. Matth. 3,16/Luke 3,21, but Mark 1,10: ...σχιζομένοις...

καὶ εἶδεν, cf. Matth. 3,16/Mark 1,10.

τὸ πνεῦμα...περιστερᾶς, cf. Matth. 3,16/Mark 1,10/Luke 3,22, but Matthew: ...τοῦ Θεοῦ...ώσει; Mark: τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς... and Luke: ...σωματικῷ εἶδει ὡς..., cf. Matth. 3,16 in syP.:  and Luke 3,22 in syS: .

κατελθούσης...εἰς αὐτὸν, cf. Mark 1,10: καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτὸν; Math. 3,16: ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτὸν; Luke 3,22: καταβῆναι..ἐπ' αὐτὸν (D: ...εἰς...); John 1,33: καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτὸν, and Epiphanius 28 15 (about the Cerinthians): καταληλύθεναι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς αὐτὸν (*scil. Jesus*) τουτέστι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἐν εἶδει περιστερᾶς...; Irenaeus, *ad.haer.* I 26 1 (about Cerinthus): *Et post baptismum descendisse in eum...Christum figura columbae*, cf. Hippolytus, *Refut.* VII 33 2 (about Cerinthus): Καὶ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα κατελθεῖν εἰς αὐτὸν...τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν εἶδει περιστερᾶς.

καὶ φωνὴ...λέγουσα, cf. Matth. 3,17, but: καὶ Ιδοὺ.../Mark 1,11: καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο, but *om.* Κ^κ Δ Θ etc.) ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανῶν (add. ἡκουσθή Θ 565 etc.)/Luke 3,22: καὶ φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι (add. λεγουσαν Κ Α Θ f.1 f.13 etc.).

σὺ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, cf. Mark 1,11/Luke 3,22, but: σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου...

· ἐν σοὶ πνεόκτησα, cf. Mark 1,11/Luke 3,22, but: τῷδ. in Ψ Λ Δ 579 1241 etc.

ἔγω σύμερον γεγένυντκά σε, cf. Luke 3,22 in D a b c d ff² 1 r and can also be found with Justin, Clement, Origen, Methodius and Augustine.⁴⁸

καὶ εὐθὺς...φῶς μέγα. The verb περιλάμπω can be found in Luke 2,9: δόξα κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς and Acts 26,13. A similar idea can be found in a number of ancient Christian authors. We will come back to this later.

δὶ ιδών ὁ Ἰωάννης...σὺ τίς εἶ, cf. Matth.11,3/Luke 7,19 and John 1,33.34.

⁴⁸ See for a discussion of this passage H. Schürmann, *Das Lukas-Evangelium 1, Herders Theol. Kommentar zum N.T. III* (Herder 1969) 193-194.

οὗτός ἔστιν...ηὔδοκησα, cf. Matth. 3,17, but...ἐν ὧ εἰδόκησα. The words εὐδοκέω ἐπί can also be found in Judith 15,11; Is. 54,17 and Jer. 2,19 in the LXX.

καὶ τότε...προσπεσών. This passage deviates from a similar one in Matth. 3,14-15. We shall also return to this later.

δέομαι..πάντα, cf. Matth. 3,14-15

This passage again appears to be a composite of words and phrases which have been taken from the canonical Gospels. In this case the influence of Matthew seems to be prominent. This is especially apparent from the end of the passage which contains the question of John the Baptist. However, the structure of the present passage differs from that of the Matthew text. The voice from heaven is heard twice, the first time uttering words that agree with Mark/Luke and the second time with words that agree with Matthew. This second time the voice answers a question of John the Baptist. It is only after this answer that John comes to the conclusion that it is impossible for him to baptize Jesus. This order of events is more logical than that in Matthew which has John asking his question before he knows who Jesus really is.

Next a few details call for our attention. The word ἐν εἴδει is a semitism which, however, does not mean that the Gospel considered here was written in a Semitic language. The phrase κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτὸν do not differ much from its parallels in the synoptic Gospels, but the words do more or less agree with quotations given by Hippolytus and Epiphanius from Jewish-Christian sources. We assume that εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτὸν underlines the idea that the Spirit entered into Jesus. However, this cannot be disconnected from the reference to Ps. 2,7, viz. ἐγώ σήμερον. γεγένηκα σε. These words were obviously meant to show that Jesus was adopted by God as his son. This is already the conclusion drawn by Epiphanius who writes after having quoted the beginning of this Gospel: "...they insist that Jesus was really man, as I said, and that Christ came into being in him because he descended in the form of a dove".⁴⁹

The passage about the light asks for careful consideration. The same text can be found in Tatian's Diatessaron and later Syriac witnesses.⁵⁰ It has to be distinguished from a similar tradition about fire which is said to have been seen at the moment of Jesus' baptism. Justin the Martyr is a representative of this second view.⁵¹

⁴⁹ See Epiphanius, *Panarion* 33 14 4, ed. K. Holl, *GCS*, Epiphanius I, 351,17-19.

⁵⁰ See Éphrem de Nisibe, *Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant ou Diatessaron* II 5, ed. L. Leloir, *Sourc. Chrét.* 121 (Paris 1966) 95: "Et quand la splendeur de la lumière apparut sur l'eau et la voix du ciel..." (Armenian Text), see also 95, n. 4 with references to other Syriac witnesses.

⁵¹ See Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tr.* 88,3, ed. Goodspeed 202. The same is found in Ps. Cyprianus, *de Rebaptismate* 16, ed. G. Rauschen, *Tertulliani de baptismo...* *Floril. Patrist.* XI (Bonnae 1926) 70,8-13, and *Orac. Sibyll.* VI 6-7, ed. A. Kurfess, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen, Tusculum-Bücherei* (1951) 148 and VII 82-84, 154.

It is difficult to imagine that the two ideas originated separately. This means that one of the two has to be the original view. We might perhaps suggest that Tatian who was a pupil of Justin, was responsible for the alteration. If this is true, it is easy to understand why the idea of light was widely accepted in the Syriac world. And in this case too, the Gospel according to the Ebionites would be one of those writings that were influenced by Tatian.⁵²

Twice a voice from heaven is heard. We could explain this as an effort to harmonise the Gospels of Mark and Luke (first question) and Matthew (second question). The author of the Ebionite Gospel appears to be responsible for the insertion of the question between the two voices the words of which have been taken from Matth. 11,3/Luke 7,19.

Only once the second voice has spoken is John supposed to understand who Jesus is. A similar idea can be found in the Gospel of John (cf. 1,32-34) according to which the events of Jesus' baptism are meant to reveal his divine origin. However, the theological background is different. In John we are dealing with the idea of a so-called hidden Messiah. He was supposed to be present as the Messiah but he was not recognized as such. In the present Gospel Jesus is held to become God's son only after having been baptised.

The passage ends with a short dialogue between John and Jesus. The text slightly deviates from that in Matth. 3,14-15. John fell down to the ground according to this Gospel and this is absent in Matthew. Matthew says that John rejects the idea of baptising Jesus, but here it is only said that John asks Jesus to baptise him. On the other hand we see that the passages in both Gospels contain the words ὃ δὲ ἐκώλυσεν. They have been obviously taken from Matthew but they are hardly appropriate in the context of the present Gospel.

In Matth. 3,15 it is said ὅφες ἄρτι, οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶ τίμιν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην. The words πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην which are present in Matthew are missing here. The word "righteousness" is often found in Matthew (cf. 5,6.10.20; 6,1 and 33). This means that the present Gospel deviates from Matthew in a phrase which can be called specifically Matthean. We wonder whether this means that the Gospel according to the Ebionites used a pre-Matthean tradition.

The result of all this is that the text of this reference shows the influence of the synoptic Gospels. The hand of the author of this Gospel is clearly visible. He introduced his own ideas into the canonical tradition but he also may be depending upon pre-canonical sources.

⁵² This idea has been proposed by H. J. W. Drijvers and G. J. Reinink, *Taufe und Licht. Tatian, Ebionäerevangelium und Thomasakten, Text and Testimony. Essays...in honour of A. F. J. Klijn* (Kampen 1988) 91-110. In this article the influence of the Gospel of John on Tatian has been emphasized. However, the influence of the Gospel of John appears to be absent in the Gospel according to the Ebionites. On the other hand, we have to accept a common tradition which comes to light in a tendency to harmonise the available material.

X

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 14 5

ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus...*, 351,21-26

ca. 375

Source: Gospel according to the Ebionites

Πάλιν δὲ ἀφυοῦνται εἶναι αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον, δῆθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου οὐ εἰρηκεν ὁ σωτήρ ἐν τῷ ἀναγγελήσαι αὐτῷ ὅτι ἰδού ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξα ἐστήκασιν, ὅτι τίς μού ἔστι μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφοί; καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς ἔφη· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀδελφοί (MS. Μ ἀδελφαί) μου καὶ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ ἀδελφαί οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρός μου.

Further they deny that he is a man, apparently from the word that the Saviour spoke when he was told: See thy mother and thy brothers stand outside, viz. Who is my mother and who are my brothers ? And he stretched his hand over the disciples and said: Those are my brothers and my mother and my sisters who do the will of my Father.

Commentary

Epiphanius quotes this passage because he wants to show that the Ebionites do not say that Jesus is a mere man but that he can be compared with an archangel. Epiphanius did not come to this conclusion because of the text of the present Gospel, but the idea is supposed to be present in the so-called Ebionite writings as a whole.⁵³ But in order to demonstrate that this Gospel agrees with Ebionite ideas he refers to the present passage. It is also found in Matthew 12,47-50, cf. Mark 3,32-35 and Luke 8,20-21.

However, it is questionable whether the passage was really taken from the Gospel discovered by Epiphanius. He started from the idea that the Ebionites used the Gospel of Matthew, although "shortened and contaminated", which means that he was justified in quoting from the text of the canonical Matthew in order to discuss their opinions. We must wait with a final decision until we have made a comparison between this and the biblical text of the Gospels.

ἰδού...ἐστήκασιν. In Matthew 12,47 we read εἰπεν δέ τις αὐτῷ followed by the words under discussion and by ζητοῦντες σοι λαλήσαι. This agrees with the 26th edition of the Greek text edited by Aland but the entire vers 47 has been omitted by Χ^x B L Γ and other Greek manuscripts and also by ff¹ k sy^c and sa, but it is present in Χ¹ and 2 C W Z Θ f.1partim f.13 and the Byzantine Text. However, all this has no influence on the evaluation of the present passage since the omission is due to a simple case of *homoioteleuton*.⁵⁴

⁵³ See Klijn-Reinink 34

⁵⁴ See B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament* (London/New York 1971) 32.

τί μού ἔστι μήτηρ in place of τίς ἔστι ἡ μήτηρ μου.

καὶ ἀδελφοί in place of καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μού, but *om.* τίνες εἰσὶν (cf. Mark/Luke) in Σ b c g ff² sy⁵ and *om.* μού B^x.

χείρα in place of χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, but *om.* αὐτοῦ X^x D etc.

ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς in place of ...αὐτοῦ, but *om.* Δ vg.

ἔφη in place of εἶπεν with 517 1675 etc.

οὗτοι εἰσὶν...ἀδελφοί in place of οὗτοι ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου.

οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρός μου in place of ὅστις γάρ ἀν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς αὐτὸς μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἔστιν.

It appears that there are numerous differences between the text of Epiphanius and the text which is commonly used today. On the other hand we cannot say that the text of Epiphanius follows any other given type of text. We can conclude that Epiphanius was quoting from memory. It was sufficient to show that according to this passage Jesus calls God his Father. Even if the passage occurred in this form in the Gospel according to the Ebionites it seems to have been in a free form.

XI

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 14 5

ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus...*, 354,6-8

ca. 375

Source: Gospel according to the Ebionites

‘Ως τὸ παρ’ αὐτοῖς εὐαγγέλιον καλούμενον περιέχει, ὅτι ἔλθον καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν, οὐ παύσεται ἀφ’ ὑμῶν ὄργη.

As their Gospel mentioned above shows: I Have come to abolish sacrifices and if you do not stop sacrificing the wrath will not cease from you.

Commentary

Epiphanius quoted the text in the context of a passage in which he was trying to say that the Ebionites accept that Jesus is like one of the archangels. He was able to abolish part of the Law because he was a heavenly being. Here it is said that the temple and the sacrifices have been rejected.

The rejection of sacrifices is widely known in Jewish-Christian circles and can be found in Ps. Clement, *Hom.* III 56 4 and *Recogn.* I 37 and 39. Epiphanius writes that the Nazoreans rejected this practice also, cf. *Panarion* 28 1 4, as did the Elkesaites, cf. *Panarion* 19 3 6.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ H.-J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums* (Tübingen 1949) 219-242.

Unlike the other references this one has no parallels in the New Testament.

XII

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30 22 4

ed. K. Holl, *Ancoratus...*, 363,1-6

ca. 375

Source: Gospel according to the Ebionites

Αύτοὶ δὲ ἀφανίσαντες ὁφ' ἑαυτῶν τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκολουθίαν ἡλλαξαν τὸ ῥητόν, ὅπερ ἔστι πᾶσι φανερὸν ἐκ τῶν συνεζευγμένων λέξεων, καὶ ἐποίησαν τοὺς μαθητὰς μὲν λέγοντες· ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμέν σοι τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν, καὶ αὐτὸν δῆθεν λέγοντα· μή ἐπιθυμιά ἐπεθύμησα κρέας τοῦτο τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν. Πρόθεν δὲ οὐ φωραθήσεται ἡ αὐτῶν ῥᾶδιουργία, τῆς ἀκολουθίας κραζούσοντος ὅτι τὸ μῦ καὶ τὸ ἥτα ἔστι πρόσθετα; Ἀντὶ τοῦ γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἐπιθυμιά ἐπεθύμησα αὐτοὶ προσεθέντο τὸ μή ἐπίρρημα. Αὐτὸς δὲ ἀληθῶς ἔλεγεν ἐπιθυμιά ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν.

They, however, destroyed the true order and changed the passage; that is clear to everyone because of the words that belong to each other and they make the disciples say: Where do you wish that we prepare the Passover to eat for you? And they made him answer: I do not earnestly desire to eat meat with you this Passover. How then will this deceit not be brought to light, since, the order of the words is clear, the *mu* and the *eta* have been added? For instead of saying: I earnestly desired, they added the word *not*. Actually he said: I earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you. They, however, added meat and deceived themselves recklessly speaking the words: I did not desire earnestly to eat meat with you this Passover.

Commentary

Epiphanius quotes Luke 22,15 and next he gives the same passage according to a Jewish-Christian Gospel. The disciples ask Jesus where they should eat the Passover. This can be compared to Math. 26,17/Mark 14,12.

Jesus' answer begins with the word *μή*. This differs from the text of the synoptic Gospels where after the question Jesus sends his disciples away to make the necessary preparations.

The reference can be compared to Luke 22,15 where Jesus speaks to his disciples during the meal. Luke's text runs as follows: ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. Epiphanius rightly says that the word μή has been added to the text. A few other differences occur of which the word τὸ κρέος in place of τὸ πάσχα is the most important.

Epiphanius has given the correct meaning of the text of the Jewish-Christian Gospel. Jesus does not want to partake of the Passover because he does not wish to eat meat. It is also for this reason that the word Passover has been changed into meat.⁵⁶

This is the second reference to the Gospel according to the Ebionites in which the eating of meat is emphatically rejected (see also VII).

XIII

Didymus the Blind, *Comment. in Psalms*

ed. M. Gronewald, *Psalmenkommentar III, Papyr. Texte und Abhandl.* 8 (Bonn 1969) 184,9-10
398

Source: Gospel according to the Hebrews

τὸν Μαθθαῖον δοκεῖ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν Λευὶν ὀνομάζειν, οὐκ ἔστιν δὲ αὐτός, ἀλλὰ ὁ κατασταθεὶς ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὁ Μαθθίας καὶ ὁ Λευὶς εἰς διώνυσοι εἰσιν. ἐν τῷ καθ' Ἐβραίους εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦτο φαίνεται.

It seems that Matthew is named Levi in the Gospel according to Luke. But they are not the same, but Matthias who replaced Judas and Levi are the same with a double name. This appears from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Commentary

According to the various lists given in the New Testament (cf. Mark 3,18/Matth. 10,3/Luke 6,15/Acts 1,13) Matthew is one of the apostles. He is otherwise never mentioned in the New Testament apart from in Matth. 9,9, where, however, the parallel passages in Mark 2,14 and Luke 5,27-29 speak of a man called Levi.⁵⁷ It is on the basis of this identification in Matthew that it is almost generally accepted in the early Church that Matthew was also called Levi and that he was a tax-collector.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ See also J. Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (Göttingen 1960) 201-203.

⁵⁷ See R. Pesch, *Levi-Matthäus* (Mc 2,14/Mt 9,9). Ein Beitrag zur Lösung eines alten Problems, *ZNW* 59 (1968) 40-56, and D. Lührmann, *Das Bruchstück aus dem Hebräerevangelium bei Didymus von Alexandrien*, *Nov. Test.* 29 (1987) 265-279.

⁵⁸ See R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden* II/2 (Braunschweig 1887) 258-269.

Matthias is mentioned in Acts 1,23 in the New Testament only. He took the place of Judas. In Ps. Clement, *Recogn.* I 60 5, he is identified with Barnabas (cf. Acts 4,36)⁵⁹ and with Zaccheus (cf. Luke 19,2) in Clement, *Strom.* IV 6 35.⁶⁰ In Aphraates, *Dem.* IV 6, and in the Syriac translation of Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* I 12 3; II 1 1; III 25 6; 29 4 and 39 10, Matthias is called *Matthias*.⁶¹ But all this is of no help in explaining the identification of Levi and Matthias.

The following suggestion might solve the problem. Both the name Matthew and Matthias are translations of the Hebrew מִתְתָּחֵת.⁶² However, this name is also rendered in Greek by words like ματθαθίας, ματθίας, ματταθίας, ματταθία, μαθθίας, μαθθαθίας, μαθθανίας and μαθθίας.⁶³ From this it appears that the name Matthias was known among Greek-speaking Jews.

If Hebrew- or Aramaic-speaking Jewish-Christian circles knew an apostle by the name מתתיהו, it is easy to explain how that this name was translated as Matthias by some Greek-speaking Christians and as Matthew by others. The occurrence of two or even more different renderings of the same Hebrew name is quite normal.

The result of all this is that Matthias in this context seems to be no one other than Matthew.⁶⁴

xiv

Jerome, in *Ephes.* 5.4

ed. Migne, PL 26, 552C/D
386/7

Source: Gospel according to the Hebrews

...ut in Hebraico quoque Evangelio legimus, Dominum ad discipulos loquentem: Et nunquam, inquit, laeti sitis, nisi cum fratrem vestrum videritis in charitate

⁵⁹ ed. B. Rehm-F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen II, Rekognitionen*, GCS 51 (Berlin 1965) 42.21.

⁶⁰ Clemens Alexandrinus, *strom.* IV VI 35 1, ed. O. Stählin, *GCS*, Clemens II (Leipzig 1906) 265.

⁶¹ ed. I. Parisot, *Patrol. Syr.* I/1 (Parisii 1894) 149 and ed. W. Wright and N. McLean (Cambridge 1898) 49, 60, 156, 161. See also K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Christianity Pt. I: The Acts of the Apostles IV* (London 1933) 14-15, and especially S. Brock, A new Testimonium of the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews', *NTS* 18 (1971/2) 220-222.

⁶² מ ה |נוּ or מ ה |נִיהָ or מ ה |נִיהָה and less probable מ ה |תִּיהָה Or

⁶³ See E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance of the Septuagint II* (Oxford 1897) 109 of the Supplement and B. Reicke, *s.v.* Matthanja, *Bibl.-Hist. Handwörterbuch II* (Göttingen 1964) 1171.

⁶⁴ This is not the place to look at the problem related to Acts 1,12-26, but we wonder whether this story and the identification of Levi and Matthew in the Gospel of Matthew are not two independent efforts to legitimize a certain "Matthew" who was only known from the traditional lists of the apostles.

...as we read in the Hebrew Gospel that the Lord said to the disciples: And never rejoice, he said, unless when you look at your brother in love.

Commentary

The quotation has no exact parallel in the New Testament. We might compare Matth. 5,24 about the necessity of making peace with "your brother" but the relationship is not close.

The idea that one has to be joyful is present in the New Testament, cf. Matth. 5,12; Philipp. 2,18; 3,1 and 4,4 and also Luke 10,20. The expression *fratrem vestrum* can also be found in Matth. 5,24 to which we have already referred above.

The expression *videtur in charitate* asks for some comment. The word *videtur* has to be understood in the sense of "to pay attention to" which is the meaning of the Hebrew **תַּקְהַל** in, for example Ps. 9,14; 25,18 and 31,8, where the Latin translation uses the word *videre* and the LXX *ἰδέ*, but in Ps. 31 (30),8 *ἐπειδέες*. In all these passages God is the subject of this verb. In the New Testament we meet *ἰδέ* with the same meaning in John 11,34 and 12,19, where the Latin again reads *vide* in 11,34 and *ecce* in 12,19.

xv

Jerome, *de viris illustribus* II

ed. C.A. Bernouilli, *Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengesch. Quellenschr.* II (Freiburg i.B. und Leipzig 1895. Frankfurt 1968) 8

⁶⁵ *Dem.* XX, ed. L. Parisot, in: *Patr. Syr.* I/1 (Parisiis 1894) 928.

⁶⁶ ed. L. Leloir, *Saint Ephrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant...*, XV 8, *Chester Beatty Monographs*, No. 8 (Dublin 1963) 144.

⁶⁷ ed. D. Plooy, *De Liège Diatessaron, Verhandel. der Kon. Akademie van Wetensch. te Amsterdam afd. Letterkunde, nwe R. Deel XXXI Part IV* (1935) 347.

392

Source: Gospel according to the Hebrews

...et euangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebreos et a me nuper in graecum sermonem latinumque translatum est, quo et Adamantius saepe utitur, post resurrectionem Saluatoris refert: Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem seruo sacerdotis, iit ad Iacobum et apparuit ei (iurauerit enim Iacobus se non comesurum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini, donec uiderat eum resurgentem a dormientibus) rursumque post paululum: Adferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Statimque additur: Tulit panem et benedixit et fregit et dedit Iacobo Iusto et dixit ei: Frater mi, comedere panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus.

...and also the Gospel which is called according to the Hebrews and which I have recently translated into Greek and Latin of which also Origen often makes use, says after the account of the resurrection of the Lord: But the Lord after he had given a linen cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him (for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from the hour in which he drank the cup of the Lord until he had seen him rising again from those who sleep), and again, a little later, it says: Bring the table and bread, said the Lord. And immediately it is added: He brought bread and blessed and brake it and gave it to James the Just and said to him: My brother, eat thy bread for the Son of Man is risen from those who sleep.

Parallel Texts

1. Jerome, *de viris illustribus graeco sermone*

ed. Migne, P.L. 23, 612B-614A

?

καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον δὲ τὸ ἐπιγραφέν καθ' Ἐβραίους, ὅπερ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ νῦν εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν καὶ Ῥωμαϊκὴν γλώτταν μετεβλήθη, Ὡ καὶ Ὡριγένης πολλάκις κέχρηται, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος λέγει· δὲ δέ κύριος δεδωκὼς σινδόνα τῷ δούλῳ τοῦ Ἱερέως ὅπελθων πρὸς Ἰάκωβον, ἤνοιξεν αὐτῷ ὅμιλούς κει γὰρ Ἰάκωβος μὴ γεύσασθαι ἄρτου ἐξ ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας ἀφ' ἣς πεπώκει τὸ ποτήριον δέ κύριος ἔως οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν. Αὕθις δέ μικρὸν ὑστερον· δότε, φησὶν δέ κύριος, τράπεζαν καὶ ἄρτον. Εὐθὺς δέ προστίθεται· λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ δεδωκὼς Ἰακώβῳ τῷ δικαίῳ λέγει αὐτῷ· ἀδελφέ μου ἔσθιε τὸν ἄρτον τὸν σόν· ἡγέρθη γὰρ δὲ οὐδὲς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν

And the Gospel that is entitled according to the Hebrews which has now been translated by me into Greek and Latin and of which also Origen often made

use, says after the account of the resurrection of the Saviour: But the Lord after he had given the linen cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James and revealed himself to him; for James had sworn that he would not taste bread from the hour in which the Lord drank the cup until he had seen him risen from the dead. And again a little later it says: Give me the table, said the Lord, and bread. And immediately it is added: He took bread, blessed it and brake it and gave it to James the Just and said to him: My brother, eat thy bread for the Son of Man is risen from the dead.

2. Ps. Abdias, *Historiae Apostolicae* VI 1

ed. J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (Hamburg 1703) 593
6th cent.

Quorum minor natu Jacobus Christo Salvatore in primis semper dilectus, tanto rursus desiderio in Magistrum flagrabat, ut crucifixo eo cibum capere noluerit, priusquam a mortuis resurgentem videret, quod meminerit sibi et fratribus a Christo agente in vivis fuisse praedictum. Quare ei primum omnium ut et Mariae Magdalena et Petro apparere voluit, ut discipulum in fide confirmaret, et ne diutinum ieiunium toleraret, favo mellis oblato ad comedendum insuper Jacobum invitavit.

Of those James the Less was always especially loved by Christ the Saviour. In his turn he was so burning of loving for the Master that He did not want to take food after He was crucified before he would see Him rising from the dead. He and his brothers remembered that this was predicted by Christ when He was working among the living. He wanted, therefore, first of all to appear to him and Mary Magdalen and Peter to confirm the disciple in the faith and to avoid that He would suffer any longer from fasting. He offered him a honeycomb and after this he invited James to eat.

3. Gregorius Episcopus Turonensis, *Historiarum Libri Decem* I 22

ed. W. Giesebricht u. R. Buchner, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur Deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters* II (Darmstadt 1955, 1977²) 38
sec. half 6th cent.

Fertur Iacobus apostolus, cum Domino iam mortuum vidisset in cruce, detestasse atque iurasse, numquam se comisurum panem, nisi Dominum cerneret resurgentem. Tertia denum die rediens Dominus, spoliato tartaro cum triumpho. Iacobo se ostendens ait: Surge, Iacobe, comedere, quia iam a mortuis resurrexi. Hic est Iacobus Iustus, quem fratrem Domini nuncupant, pro eo quod Ioseph fuerit filius ex alia uxore progenitus.

It is said that James the apostle cursed and swore when he had seen that the Lord was dead on the cross, never to eat bread, unless he should see the Lord risen. When the Lord returned on the third day after he had triumphantly deprived hell, he showed himself to James and said: Stand up, James, eat because I am already risen from the dead. This is James the Just whom they call the brother of the Lord because he was a son of Joseph born of an other wife.

4. Irish Reference Bible

München Staatsbibliothek MS. Chn. 14277, fol. 285^r, 12-20
ca. 800

De eo testatur euangelium eius secundum Ebreas et a me nuper (MS. etamenu per) in graecum et latinum translatum. Quod et Orien(es) (i.e. Origenes) uti (i.e. uitur) post resurrectionem domini refert: Dominus cum dedisset sindonem seruo sacerdoti ibit ad Iacobum et apparuit ei. Jurauerit enim Jacobus se non commessurum panem ab illa hora qua biberet (corr. -berat) calicem dominus (corr. -ni) donec uideret eius resurrectionem a mortuis. Inde dominus post benedixit panem et fregit et dedit Iacobo dicens ei: Frater mi, comedere panem tuum, quia surrexit filius hominis.

About this his Gospel according to the Hebrews bears witness which I have translated into Greek and Latin of which also Origen makes use when it says after the account of the resurrection: The Lord after he had given a linen cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from the hour in which the Lord drank the cup (corr.: in which he drank the cup of the Lord) until he had seen his resurrection from the dead. After this the Lord blessed the bread and brake it and gave it to James saying to him: My brother, eat thy bread for the son of Man is risen.

5. Sedulius Scottus, *Collectanea in omnes B. Pauli Epistolas, In Epist. I ad Corinthos cap.XV*

Migne, PL 103, 158A

10th cent.

Deinde Jacobo (15,7), Alphaei filio, qui se testatus est a coena Domini non commesurum panem, usquequo uideret Christum resurgentem; sicut in Evangelio secundum Hebraeos legimus.

Then James, the son of Alphaeus who swore that he would not eat bread from the table of the Lord until he would have seen the risen Lord as we read in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

6. Jacobus a Voragine, *Legenda Aurea* LXVII

ed. Th. Graesse (Osnabrück 1965, reprint of 1890³) 287
13th cent.

In Parasceue autem, mortuo domino, sicut dicit Josephus et Hieronymus in libro de viris illustribus, Jacobus votum vovit, se non comesurum, donec videret dominum a mortuis surrexisse. In ipsa autem die resurrectionis, cum usque ad diem illam Jacobus non gustasset cibum, eidem dominus apparuit, ac eis, qui cum eo erant, dixit: Ponite mensam et panem. Deinde panem accipiens benedixit et dedit Jacobo Iusto dicens: Surge frater mi, comedere; quia filius hominis a mortuis resurrexit.

However, on Friday when the Lord died, James took an oath as Josephus says and Jerome in a book about the Illustrious Men that he would not eat until he had seen the Lord risen from the dead. On that day of the resurrection, then, until which day James had not tasted food, the Lord appeared to him and to those who were with him and said: Put down a table and bread. Next he took bread and blessed and gave it to James the Just with the words: Stand up, my brother, eat because the Son of Man has risen from the dead.

Commentary

The various versions of the tradition about James show that the story was popular. The reason for this must have been that not much information about James, the brother of the Lord, can be found in the New Testament. And whatever has been said seems to be contradictory. In Mark 6,3 it is said that James and his brothers and sisters declare that Jesus is out of his mind. At the end of the Gospels nothing is said to the possibility of James' presence at the death of Jesus or in the days before. However, in Gal. 1,19, he is mentioned as one of the apostles but we wonder how to explain his nomination. We only know that according to 1 Cor. 15,7 he is one among a number of persons to whom Jesus appeared after the Resurrection. Clearly such information would have been a welcome addition to the data about the historical life of James.

First we shall look at the various versions of this tradition. The *vetus interpretatio* does not deviate much from the original Latin text. The following variant readings can be found. The word *resurrexit* at the end of the passage has been translated by ἦγέρθη, although earlier in the context the word *resurgentem* was correctly given by ἀναστάντα. Next we see that the phrase *a dormientibus* has twice been translated by ἐκ νεκρῶν. More important, however, is that the words *ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini* have been rendered by ἀφ' ἣς πεπάκει τὸ ποτήριον ὁ κύριος. This represents a considerable difference, since according to Jerome the brother of Jesus decided to start fasting at the moment

at which he himself drank the cup of the Lord, which means during the Last Supper. According to the Greek version, however, this happened at the moment that Jesus "drank the cup", which means during his suffering. The expression "Jesus drank the cup" can be found in Mark 10,38-39/Math. 20,22-12, cf. Mark 20,39/Math. 14,36/Luke 22,42/John 18,11 and it refers always to his crucifixion and death. It is striking that the word *domini* is found only in the Irish Reference Bible, whereas all other versions read *dominus*. We assume that they all, directly or indirectly, depend upon a Latin version of Jerome, and this can only mean that the word *dominus* has been used instead of *domini* at some stage in the textual development of Jerome's work. It is not easy to understand a development the other way round because the New Testament tradition is unaware of the presence of James at the last supper.⁶⁸

Ps. Abdias gives the bare facts only. However, a few particulars call for our attention. There is mention here of *minor natu Jacobus* but nothing is said about a relationship with Jesus. Nevertheless, we can identify this *minor natu Jacobus* with the brother of Jesus. Jerome already writes in *adv. Helvidium de perpetua virginitate B. Mariae* that Mary, the Mother of James ὁ μικρός or *minor* and Joses in Mark 15,41, is the same as Mary the wife of Cleopas mentioned in John 19,41 and that Cleopas is again the same as Alphaeus the father of James the disciple (cf. Matth. 10,3/Math 3,18/Luke 6,15). This would then mean that James the so-called brother of Jesus, was in fact his cousin.⁶⁹

Ps. Abdias reminds his readers of the appearance of Jesus to Mary of Magdala (John 20,16) and Peter (John 21,1). This was added to the story to de-emphasize this special appearance to James. The addition of *favo mellis oblato* agrees with the text of the Vulgate in Luke 24,42.⁷⁰

Gregory of Tours is slightly more faithful to the text of Jerome than Ps. Abdias but he also omits some particulars. On the other hand he adds the words *spoliato tartaro* and he gives his own comments on the relation of Jesus to James who is supposed to be the son of Joseph from an earlier marriage. This is also already known to Jerome who speaks about it at the beginning of the passage about James in his *de viris illustribus*, although he prefers the solution which has been quoted above.⁷¹ Finally we see that he more or less follows Jerome saying

⁶⁸ The reading *dominus* in Jerome is supported by A. Resch, *Agrapha* 250 and J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London 1888), but rejected by Th. Zahn, *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons* II/2, 700-701, see also Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu* 164.

⁶⁹ See Hieronymus, *De perp. Virginitate B. Mariae* Liber 12 and 13, Migne, PL 23, 206A: *Restat conclusio, ut Maria ista quae Jacobi Minoris scribitur mater, fuerit uxor Alphaei, et soror Mariae matris Domini, quam Mariam Cleophae Joannes evangelista cognominat...*, see also Lightfoot, o.c., 252-257.

⁷⁰ In some Old Latin manuscripts we find both *et favum mellis* and *de favo mellis*. The Greek manuscripts Θ f.1 f.13 etc. add καὶ ὁπό μελισσοῖς κρίποι (or κρίψοι).

⁷¹ See Jerome, *de viris illustribus* II, ed. Bernouilli, 6-7: *Iacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Iustus, ut nonnulli existimant, filius Joseph ex alia uxore, ut autem mihi uidetur, Mariae sororis matris Domini, cuius Iohannes in libro suo meminit (cf. 19,25).*

Surge, Iacobe, comedē, quia iam a mortuis surrexit, although he omits *frater mi* and he avoids the title *filius hominis*.

The *Irish Reference Bible* depends upon Jerome to such an extent that even Jerome's own introduction to the passage has been added to the quotation proper.

Sedulius Scottus gives the facts only. It is interesting that he speaks of James the son of Alphaeus. As we have already seen above this James *minor natu* was identified by Jerome with "the brother of the Lord".

Finally, *Jacobus a Voragine* gives a long text in which it is said that the tradition has been handed down by Josephus and Jerome. This, however, is to be explained on the basis of Jerome's reference to Josephus in his *de viris illustribus* II. Interesting are the words *Surge frater mi, comedē; quia filius hominis a mortuis resurrexit*, because although they more or less agree with the text of Jerome, the word *Surge* can only be found in Gregory.

The relationship of the parallel passages to each other is difficult to establish. For example, Gregory may be responsible for the word *Surge* but it is impossible to say that *Jacobus a Voragine* who uses the same word, depends upon Gregory. We may even go as far as to conclude that none of these writers depends upon any other. However, neither can we say that they immediately depend on Jerome. We are dealing with a development of the tradition some of whose links are missing. Yet we also have to conclude that none of the witnesses known to us contributes to a better understanding of the reference given by Jerome.

The following can be said about the text itself. The introduction *dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis* reminds us of a passage in the *Acts of Thomas* which reads: ἐκέλευσεν δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος τῷ διακόνῳ αὐτοῦ παραθεῖναι τράπεζαν παρέθηκαν δὲ συμψέλλον δὲ εὖρον ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἀπλώσας σιδόνα ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐπέθηκεν ἄρτον τῆς εὐλογίας.⁷² The *Acts of Thomas* speak of the preparations for a eucharistic meal. Here too a servant is asked to lay the table and to prepare a meal.

We also read that James took an oath that he would fast until the moment that Jesus rose from the dead. It is not unknown in Jewish and Christian literature for someone to take an oath in order to underline his intent.⁷³ This is what was supposed to have happened during the last supper. We have already remarked that according to the New Testament this event took place in the inner circle of the disciples. The idea that James was the son of Alphaeus would solve the difficulty but we wonder whether this genealogical invention was already known to the author of a Hebrew-Christian Gospel.

The appearance to James is only known from 1 Cor. 15,5-6 which is certainly a very ancient tradition which might have been of Jewish-Christian

⁷² ed. Lipsius-Bonnet, *Acta Apost. Apocr.* II/2, 165,18-166,1.

⁷³ See H. Strack u. P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* I (München 1926) 767 and Acts 23,12.

origin.

The idea that Jesus appears during a meal agrees with traditions present in canonical Gospels such as Luke 24,13-35; 42-43 and John 21,5-14; 15-23, but the allusion to an eucharistic meal is never as prominent as it is here. On the other hand we may conclude that the tradition is ancient because here is spoken of bread only.⁷⁴

The addition "the Just" after the name of James can be found in Hegesippus, according to Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* II 23 4 and 7, cf. also Epiphanius, *Panarion* 78 7, and Clement of Alexandria, *Hypoth.*, fr. 17 and 19, see Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* II 1 4. It is certainly of Jewish-Christian origin.⁷⁵ The use of the term "Son of Man" is striking since it is not only found in the New Testament in the Gospels and Acts 7,56 in the New Testament, but also in the story about James in Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* II 23 13, according to whom James asked: "What do you ask me about the Son of Man"⁷⁶ Finally, the term *a dormientibus* seems to be an ancient expression which is found in, for example, 1 Cor. 15,20 and 1 Thess. 4,13,14 and 15.

The present reference contains some typically Jewish-Christian elements. James the Just is the principal figure and the author wanted to show that he was already one of Jesus' followers before the crucifixion.

XVI

Jerome, *in Matthaeum* 6,11

ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, *Commentariorum in Mattheum Libri IV*, CCSL LXXVII (Turnholti 1969) 37

398

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoreans

In euangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos pro supersubstantiali pane maar repperi, quod dicitur crastinum...

In the Gospel which is called according to the Hebrews, I found MAAR in place of "which is necessary to support life" which means "for tomorrow"...

Parallel Texts

1. Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo* CXXXV

⁷⁴ Cf. Luke 24,30; Acts 2,46; Acts of Thomas ch. 27, 29 and 138, see also Ps. Clement, *Hom. XI* 36 2, ed. Rehm-Irmscher-Paschke 172,7-8.

⁷⁵ See Schoeps, *Theologie...*, 122-136.

⁷⁶ See R. N. Longenecker, The Christology of early Jewish Christianity, *Studies in Bibl. Theol.*, sec. Ser. 17 (London 1970) 82-93.

ed. G. Morin, *Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri tractatus sive homiliae, Analecta Maredsolana* II,2 (Maredsoli 1897) 262
after 392

In hebraico euangelio secundum Matthaeum ita habet: Panem nostrum crastinum da nobis hodie, hoc est panem quem daturus es nobis in regno tuo, da nobis hodie.

In the Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew it is said in this way: Give us today our bread for the following day; that is the bread which will be given in thy Kingdom, give us to-day.

2. Sedulius Scottus, *Super Evangelium Mathei*

ed. B. Löfstedt, *Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus 1,1-11,1, Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 14 (Freiburg 1989) 200
10th cent.

In euangelio, quod appellatur 'Secundum Ebreos' pro 'supersubstantiali pane' 'moar' repperi, quod dicitur 'crastinum'...

In the Gospel which is called according to the Hebrews instead of bread which is necessary to support life I found moar which means "for tomorrow"

Commentary

Jerome wants to say that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews the word רָמָרָה or רָמָרָה⁷⁷ is used in place of the Greek ἐπιούσιος. This would mean that Matth. 6,11 is speaking of "bread for the following day".⁷⁸

The Greek word is notoriously difficult to translate. Generally speaking two possibilities exist. The word can be derived from the verb ἐπιένειν which means that it has to be translated by "the following day", or from ἐπείνειν in which case "for this day" has to be preferred. The second meaning can be defended because an Egyptian source gives the word ἐπιούσιον which has to be read ἐπιούσια in the sense of "for this day" or "daily ration".⁷⁹ On the other hand we find the first meaning in such expressions as (τι) ἐπιούσιον (τιμέρα), cf. Acts 7,26; 16,11; 20,15 and 21,18.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ See for this second suggestion M.-J. Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 327-328.

⁷⁸ The text of *Tract. de Psalmo CXXXV* has *crastinum*. This shows that Jerome was acquainted with this reading. The date of this writing is unknown, see Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.* III,620, but "nach De vir. ill. ".

⁷⁹ See F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* I (1915) 222 and 224.

⁸⁰ See also D. Y. Hadidian, The Meaning of ἐπιούσιος and the Codices Sergii, *NTS* 5 (1958/9) 75-81, and G. Strecker, *Die Bergpredigt. Ein exegetischer Kommentar* (Göttingen 1984) 121-123, with references, and also Foerster, s.v. ἐπιούσιος, *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T.* II 587-595.

This means that the Hebrew word to which Jerome refers supports a particular translation of the Greek word. We wonder, however, whether this Jewish-Christian Gospel reproduces an original Hebrew or Aramaic source of the Gospel of Matthew. It is possible that the Hebrew word marks just another effort to render a difficult Greek word.⁸¹ It is not even alone in its choice since also the Boharic version of the New Testament happens to have chosen the same translation.

XVII

Jerome, *in Matthaeum* 12,13

ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, 90

398

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoreans

In euangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae quod nuper in graecum de hebreo sermone transtulimus et quod uocatur a plerisque Mathei authenticum, homo iste qui aridam habet manum caementarius scribitur, istiusmodi uocibus auxilium precans: Caementarius eram manibus uictum quaeritans, precor te, Iesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos.

In the Gospel which the Nazoreans and the Ebionites use which we translated recently from Hebrew to Greek and which is called the authentic text of Matthew by a good many, it is written that the man with the withered hand is a mason, praying for help with words of this kind: I was a mason earning my living with my hands, I pray you, Jesus, to restore my health lest I must beg shamefully for my food.

Parallel Texts

1. Rabanus Maurus, *Comment. in Matthaeum*

Migne, *PL* 107, 923B

first half of the 9th cent.

Notandum quoque quod in Evangelio secundum Hebraeos, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae, et quod vocatur a plerisque Mathei authenticum, homo iste, qui aridam habet manum, caementarius scribitur, istiusmodi vocibus auxilium precans: Caementarius eram, manibus uictum quaeritans; precor te, Iesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos.

⁸¹ See Schmidtko, *Neue Fragmente* 80-81; Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 327-328, and Vielhauer, in: Hennecke-Schneemelcher I³, 92.

It is also noteworthy that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is used by the Nazoraeans and the Ebionites and which is called by a good many the authentic text of Matthew, that man who has a withered hand, is described as mason who is praying for help with words of this kind: I was a mason, earning my living with my hands, I pray you, Jesus, restore my health lest I must beg shamefully for my food.

2. Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matthaeo Libri XII*

ed. Beda Paulus, CCSL-LVIA (Turnholti 1984) 652
middle 9th cent.

Porro in Euangelio quo utuntur Nazareni legitur quod hic cementarius fuerit...

Next it is said in the Gospel which use the Nazoraeans that this man was a mason...

3. Zacharias Chrysopolitani, *In unum ex quatuor liber secundus*

Migne, PL 186, 220C
beg. 12th cent.

Aeger iste dicitur fuisse caementarius, quaeritans victum manibus...

That sick man is said to have been a mason who begged that he earned his living with his hands...

4. *Diatessaron Leodiense*

ed. D. Plooy a.o., The Liège Diatessaron, *Verhandel. der kon. Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, afd. Letterkunde, nwe Reeks XXXI, Part II* (Amsterdam 1931) 161
sec. half 13th cent.

...aldaer so was en mensche din sine rechte hant verdorret was so dat hire net werken en mochte.

There was a man there whose right hand was withered so that he could not work with it.

Commentary

Rabanus Maurus clearly depends on Jerome. The same can be said of Paschasius Radbertus, although he does not give more than a few words.

We have to be careful with Zacharias Chrysopolitanus. He wrote a commentary on the Diatessaron and in the text the additional information of the man with the withered hand may have been present. This seems to be corroborated by the text of the Liège Diatessaron.

However, the text of the Liège Diatessaron can easily be explained from the canonical version of the passage and the text of Zacharias with *caementarius, quaeritans victimum manibus* seems to be derived from Jerome. Thus we may conclude that the Diatessaron as far as the text is known to us appears to differ from the text of the Jewish-Christian Gospel quoted by Jerome.⁸²

XVIII

Jerome, *in Matthaeum* 23,35

ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, 220

398

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

In euangelio quo utuntur Nazareni pro filio Barachiae filium Ioiadae scriptum reperimus.

In the Gospel which the Nazoraeans use, we find that there is written son of Jojada instead of son of Barachia.

Parallel Texts

1. Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matthaeo Libri XII*

ed. Beda Paulus, CCSL LVIB (Turnholti 1984) 1137/8
middle 9th cent.

Tamen beatissimus Hieronymus sicut in commentario eius legitur hunc Zachariam filium Jojade sacerdotis fuisse affirmat.

But the most blessed Jerome, affirms, as it is said in his commentary, that this Zacharias was the son of Jojada, the priest.

2. Petrus Comestor, *Historia Scholastica in Evangelia* CXXXV

⁸² Contrary to D. Plooy, *A primitive Text of the Diatessaron* (Leyden 1923) 44, and D. Plooy, *A further Study of the Liège Diatessaron* (Leyden 1925) 84.

Migne, *PL* 198, 1608D
middle 12th cent.

Et est filii Barachiae, id est benedicti domini. In Evangelio Nazaraeorum legitur Joiadae.

And the son of Barachia, that is the blessed of the Lord. In the Gospel of the Nazoraeans it is read as the son of Jojada.

Commentary

In Matth. 23,35 it is said that Zachariah, the son of Berachiah, was murdered in the temple. This Zachariah is one of the Minor Prophets, cf. Zach. 1,1, but it is not known from any other source that he was killed. On the other hand it is said in 2 Chr. 24,20-21 that a certain Zachariah, the son of Jojadah (LXX : τὸν Ἀζαρίαν τὸν τοῦ Ἰωδαέ) was stoned to death in the courtyard of the temple. It is, therefore, easy to assume that the name of the father has been changed to agree with the event in Chronicles.⁸³ Since the reading quoted by Jerome is the easier one we can suppose that the one in Matthew is original. This would mean that at this place the present Jewish-Christian Gospel corrected the Gospel of Matthew or possibly its source.⁸⁴

XIX

Jerome, *in Matthaeum* 27,16

ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, 265
398

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

Iste (scil. Barabbas) in euangelio quod scribitur iuxta Hebraeos filius magistri eorum interpretatur...

The name of this man is interpreted in the Gospel which is written according to the Hebrews as son of their master...

⁸³ An other solution is found in a Scholion of Petrus of Laodicea, see C. F. G. Heinrici, *Des Petrus von Laodicea Erklärung des Matthäusevangelium, Beitr. z. Gesch. u. Erkl. des N.T.* V (Leipzig 1908) 267, which reads: ζαχαρίας δὲ τὸν Ἰωδαέ λέγει: δώνυμος γάρ ἦν.

⁸⁴ See Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 328-329; G. Bardy, *Saint Jérôme et l'Évangile selon les Hébreux*, *Mélanges de Science religieuse* III (1946) 5-36, p.19, and Resch, *Agrapha* 243.

Parallel Texts

1. Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matthaeo Libri XII*

ed. Beda Paulus, *CCSL LVIB* (Turnholti 1984) 1355
middle 9th cent.

Habebant autem tunc uinctum insignem, qui dicebatur Barrabas... Quem vultis dimittam uobis Barraban an Jesum qui dicitur Christus? Barrabas autem filius magistri eorum interpretatur...

But they had at that moment a notorious prisoner who was called Barrabas... Who do you want that I (scil. Pilate) hand over to you: Barrabas or Jesus... Barabbas, however, is interpreted as son of their master...

2. Zacharias Chrysopolitani, *In unum ex quatuor liber secundus*

Migne, *PL* 186, 570C
beg. 12th cent.

Quia Barrabas in Evangelio Hebraico filius magistri eorum interpretatur.

Because Barrabas is interpreted in the Hebrew Gospel as son of their master.

Commentary

Both Paschasius Radbertus and Zacharias Chrysopolitanus depend on Jerome. We need, therefore, only consider Jerome's remark.

Jerome seems to be saying that the name Barabbas, בָּרָבָבָס which means son of the or his father,⁸⁵ was followed by an interpretation which read "son of their master". This, however, is improbable in an Aramaic or Hebrew Gospel in which any interpretation of a Semitic name would have been superfluous. Thus we have to assume that Jerome wanted to say that in the Hebrew Gospel the name Barabbas was read in such a way that its meaning became "son of their master".⁸⁶

A name *filius magistri eorum*, however, is rather curious. The solution of this problem may be found in a remark in Origen who spoke of the name *filius magistri nostri*.⁸⁷ Whoever this "master" may be, the name itself is acceptable.

⁸⁵ See H. Strack u. P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud u. Midrasch I* (München 1926) 1031, saying that "son of (his) father" is "häufiger Personename" in Hebrew, see also Jerome, *Liber interpret. hebr. nom.* 66, 13, ed. P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingen 1887) 99: *Barabbas filius patris*.

⁸⁶ See Lagrange, L'Évangile selon les Hébreux 329, which has been taken over by Bardy, *art. cit.*, 20: "Il va sans dire que *interpretatur* ne signifie pas que l'Évangile sémitique a traduit le nom, mais qu'il a employé une forme qui suggère tel sens".

⁸⁷ See *Suppl. ad Originis Exegetica, Scholia ad Matthaeum*, Migne, *PG* 17, 308A: Πολλοῖς δὲ πάντι ἀντιγράφοις ἐντυχών, εἴρον καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν βιροβιθῶν Ἰησοῦν λεγόμενον (this can be found, for example, in Θ f.1.22 (in vs. 17 only) 229 1582 sy⁶ pal arm geo² in Matth. 20,16 and 17,

On the other hand we can understand that outsiders who did not accept this particular "master" changed the name into "*their* master".

From this we may conclude that the name originated in an Aramaic-speaking environment. The relation between the name in the New Testament and the name offered here is more difficult to establish. We do not exclude the possibility that we should seek its origin in a Greek text which offers various spellings of the name.

xx

Jerome, in Matthaeum 27.51

ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen. 275

398

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoracans

Velum templi scissum est et omnia legis sacramenta quae prius tegebantur prodita sunt atque ad gentilem populum transierunt. In euangelio cuius saepe facimus mentionem superliminare templi infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse atque diuinius legimus. Iosephus quoque refert uirtutes angelicae praesides quondam templi tunc pariter conclamassemus: Transeamus ex his sedibus.

The veil of the temple has been rent and all mysteries of the law which were formerly covered have been made public and have come over to the people of the gentiles. In the Gospel which we have already often mentioned we read that

but this does not seem to have any connection with the present question), but after this follows: ὡς γὰρ ἔσκε πατρωνυμία ἦν τοῦ ληστοῦ ὁ βαραβῆς, ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύεται διδασκάλουν. Συντιθέμενον οὖν τὸ τοῦ βαραβῆν δύνομα σημαίνειν νιός τοῦ διδασκάλουν ἡμῶν. The same words can be found in Petrus von Laodicea, *Erklärung des Matthäusevangelium*, ed. C. E. G. Heinrich, *Beitr. z. Gesch. u. Erkl. des N.T.* (Leipzig 1908) 323, cf. also Zahn, *Gesch. des neutest. Kan.* I/2, 699.

⁸⁸ See C. Tischendorf, *Nov. Test. Graece* (Leipzig 1896⁸) 195-196.

⁸⁹ Jerome, *Liber interpret. hebr. nom.* 60.28-29, cd. P. de Lagarde, 93.

a lintel of an enormous size was broken and split. Josephus also tells that the angelic powers, once the overseers of the temple, at the same moment proclaimed: Let us go away from these places.

Parallel Texts

1. Jerome, *epist. 120.8*

ed. I. Hilberg II, CSEL LV, 490
407

In euangelio autem, quod Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, legimus non velum templi scissum, sed superliminare templi mirae magnitudinis conruisse.

But in the Gospel which is written in Hebrew letters, we read not that the veil of the temple was rent but that a lintel of wonderful size of the temple collapsed.

2. Christiani Druthmari Corbeiensis Monachi (Christian of Stavelot), *Expositio in Matthaeum Evangelistam*

Migne, PL 106, 1493
9th cent.

Refert Josephus, superliminare, quod infinitum magnitudinis erat fractum esse atque divisum, etiam angelicas virtutes tunc in ipso tempore clamasse: Transeamus ex his sedibus.

Josephus says that a lintel which was of immeasurable size was broken and split up and also that the angelic forces at that time cried: Let us go away from these places.

3. Petrus Comestor, *Histona Scholastica in Evangelia CLXXVIII*

Migne, PL 198, 1633B
middle 12th cent.

Nam et in Evangelio Nazareorum superliminare templi infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse legitur auditasque voces in aere: Transeamus ex his sedibus.

Because also in the Gospel of the Nazoreans it is said that a lintel of the temple of an immeasurable size was broken and that voices were heard in the air: Let us go away from these places.

4. Hugo of St. Cher, *in librum Isaiae*

tom. IV (Venetiis 1732) 17a
middle 13th cent.

A voce clamantis, idest, propter vocem multitudinis Angelorum clamantium laudes Deo. Vel clamantium, transeamus ab his sedibus imminentie eversione Romanorum, ut legitur in Evangelio Nazaraeorum.

With a voice crying, that is, because of the voice of a multitude of angels crying the praises of God or crying: Let us go away from these places, because of the coming destruction by the Romans, as it is said in the Gospel of the Nazoraeans.

5. Historia Passionis Domini

f. 65r
14th cent.

Item in ewangelio Nazareorum legitur superliminare templi infinitae magnitudinis in morte Christi scissum. Idem dicit Josephus et addit quod audit sunt voces horribiles in aere dicentes: Transeamus ab his sedibus.

Also in the Gospel of the Nazaoraeans it is read that a lintel of the temple of an immeasurable size was broken at the moment of the death of Jesus. Also Josephus says and adds that horrible voices were heard in the air saying: Let us go away from these places.

Commentary

Jerome referred twice to the tradition about the lintel of the temple in a Jewish-Christian Gospel. The following major differences exist between the two references. In his Commentary on Matthew he writes *infinitae magnitudinis* and *fractum* and in the second *mira magnitudinis* and *scissum*. Only in the first is the name of Josephus mentioned. Later authors depend solely on the passage in the Commentary.

Jerome is not writing about this event for the first time in his Commentary on Matthew. In his Epistle to Damasus of 378/80, he had already written:⁹⁰ *Et seraphim stabant in circuitu eius: sex alae uni et sex alae alteri, quidam Graecorum, vir in scripturis adprime eruditus, seraphim virtutes quasdam in caelis esse exposuit, quae ante tribunal dei adstantes laudent eum et in diversa ministeria mittantur maximeque ad eos qui purgatione indigent et ob pristina*

⁹⁰ epist. XVIII, ed. I. Hilberg I, CSEL 54 (1910) 86. See also A. F. J. Klijn, Jérôme, Isaïe 6 et l'Évangile des Nazoréens, Vig. Christ. 40 (1986) 245-250.

peccata aliaque ex parte suppliciis. 'quod autem sublatum est', inquit, 'superliminare et domus inpleta est fumo, signum templi Iudaci destruendi et incendii universae Hierusalēm'. Nonnulli vero in superioribus consentientes in extra parte dissentunt, nam superliminare sublatum illo tempore praedican, quando uelum templi scissum est et universa domus Israhel erroris nube confusa, quando Iosephus refert sacerdotes ex adytis templi uirtutem caelestium audisse vocem: 'transeamus ex his sedibus'.

This passage is older than the two which speak of the Jewish-Christian Gospel. In this passage he quotes Is. 6,2 and he gives an interpretation of it which has been taken from a Greek scholar. This could have been Gregory of Nazianzus with whom Jerome read the scriptures in about 380 or perhaps his former teacher Apollinaris of Laodicea. The first part of the text in Isaiah presents no difficulties to Jerome. He writes that the Seraphs are angels of service which is not uncommon in Judaism and Christianity. They help people who are in need of grace. This can be deduced from the rest of the passage in Isaiah where it is said that Isaiah's lips are touched by burning coals so that his sins are taken away (see Is. 6,6-7). Next Jerome quotes the Greek scholar and writes: *quod autem sublatum est superliminare et domus inpleta est fumo, signum est templi Iudaci destruendi et incendii universae Hierusalem*. Here Is. 6,4 is quoted in a different version to that of the Latin Vulgate which reads: *et commota sunt superliminaria cardinum a voce clamantis et domus inpleta est fumo*. This last translation agrees with the Hebrew original and is also known to Jerome who as we shall see later, quotes these words in his Commentary on Isaiah. On the other hand the text of the present passage reads in the Greek version: *καὶ ἐπήρθη τὸ ὑπέρθυρον ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς τῆς ἐκέκρυψον, καὶ ὁ οἶκος ἐπλήσθη καπνοῦ*. This version is in striking agreement with the Latin text of Jerome. This confirms his remark that he is following a Greek interpretation. The main point of this interpretation is that according to Is. 6 the Temple will be destroyed.⁹¹ This interpretation is not the usual one in Jerome's view. He and *nonnulli* assume that the reference here is to the moment at which the veil of the Temple will be rent *et universa domus Israhel erroris nube confusa*. Josephus had already foretold that at that moment the angels would leave the temple.⁹²

⁹¹ This agrees with most Greek commentators, cf. Chrysostomos, in *Is. VI* 4, Migne, PG 56, 72; Cyril of Jerusalem, in *Is. I. Orat. IV*, Migne, PG 70, 176D; Procopius of Gaza, in *Is.*, Migne, PG 87 II, 1933D-1936A; Theodoret of Cyr, in *Is. VI* 4, 209, Migne, PG 81, 266C, and Des Petrus von Laodicea Erklärung des Matthäusevangeliums, ed. G. Heinrici, *Beitr. z. Gesch. u. Erkl. des N.T.* V (Leipzig 1908) 336.

⁹² See Josephus, *de Bello Iudaico* VI 299, ed. O. Michel u. O. Bauerfeind Band II,2 (Darmstadt 1969) 52. Here the voice is heard during the feast of Whitsun. See also Eusebius, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus, Eusebius Werke* VII, ed. R. Helm, GCS (Leipzig 1926) 514, who appears to date the event to the fifteenth year of the emperor Tiberius. Jerome also refers to it in *epist. XLVI* 4, ed. Hilberg I, 333, and in *in Es. LII* 4-5, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL LXIII A (Turnholti 1963) 579, in the context of the rending of the veil, and in *in Es. LXVI* 6, in the context of the destruction of the Temple.

This means that Jerome knew of two interpretations of Is. 6, viz. one about the destruction of the Temple and another about the rending of the veil at the moment of Jesus' death.

In 408/10 Jerome writes in his Commentary on Isaiah:⁹³ *Et commota sunt superliminaria cardinum a uoce clamantis; et domus impleta est fumo. Clamantibus Seraphim et in tota terra Trinitatis mysterium praedicatibus, quando passionem Domini Saluatoris terra universa cognouit, statim commotum est, siue sublatum liminare templi, et omnes illius cardines conciderunt, impleta Saluatoris comminatione, dicentis: Relinquetur uobis domus uestra deserta. Et quam pulcher ordo uerborum. Postquam terra repleta est gloria Domini Sabaoth, Iudeorum templum impletum est ignorantiae tenebris et caligine et fumo, qui noxius est oculis. Vel certe per fumum templi monstratur incendium. Prius enim euangelium Saluatoris in toto orbe praedicatum est, et post quadraginta duos annos dominicae passionis, capta Hierusalem templumque succensum est, Iudei putant templum impletum fumo thymiana significare, id est incensum, et per hoc aduentum diuinae maiestatis.*

The interpretation deals with the destruction of the temple. This explanation is not according to Jerome, the common one, as we noticed above. However, if we look at the passage more closely we see that first the text of the Vulgate is followed but that after the word *siue* we read *sublatum liminare templi* which are the words of the Greek version of this passage as we noted earlier. The explanation of this is that Jerome is quoting one of the Greek commentators who he mentioned in the Prologue of his Commentary on Isaiah.⁹⁴

We finally come to Jerome's remark about the Jewish-Christian Gospel. He states that according to this Gospel the lintel of the temple was broken at the moment of Jesus' death. This deviates from the canonical Gospels because it speaks of the rending of the veil of the Temple. In his Letter to Damasus Jerome connects these two traditions. However, originally there were two different traditions. The tradition with *superliminare* has been connected with Is. 6 on the one hand and with the coming destruction of the Temple on the other. This was known among Greek-speaking commentators. But the same tradition appears to have been known among Jewish-Christians. They spoke of a lintel *mirae* or *infinitae magnitudinis*. The tradition found its way into a Jewish-Christian Gospel. This means that it must have been not only very old but also well known.⁹⁵

⁹³ ed. M. Adriaen, in *Es. III IV 4, CCSL LXXIII* (Turnholti 1963) 87.

⁹⁴ According to the Prologue Jerome consulted Eusebius, Didymus and Apollinaris.

⁹⁵ It is not necessary that Is. 6 be the only source of the tradition of the lintel. Other passages in the Old Testament are also conceivable, cf. Amos 9,1 (LXX and Vulgate), Soph. 2,14 (LXX and Vulgate) and Zach. 12,2, where the word "lintel" is mentioned. These passages have been linked by Greek commentators to the coming destruction of the Temple.

XXI

Jerome, *in Esaiam 11,1-3*

ed. M. Adriaen, *Commentarium in Esaiam Libri I-XI, CCSL LXXIII* (Turnholti 1963) 147-148
408/10

Source: Gospel according to the Hebrews

sed iuxta euangelium quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazarei: Descendet super eum omnis fons Spiritus Sancti. Dominus autem spiritus est, et ubi spiritus Domini, ubi libertas... Porro in euangeliō cuius supra fecimus mentionem, haec scripta reperimus: Factum est autem cum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti, et requieuit super eum, et dixit illi: fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut uenires, et requiescerem in te. Tu enim es requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum.

...but according to the Gospel which was written in the Hebrew language and read by the Nazoraeans: The whole fountain of the Holy Spirit came upon him. The Lord is the Spirit and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom... Further in the Gospel which we mentioned above we find that the following is written: It happened then when the Lord ascended from the water, that the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon him and said to him: My son, I expected you among all the prophets that you should come and that I should rest upon you. For you are my rest, you are my first-born son, who shall reign in eternity.

Parallel Text

Hugo of St. Cher, *in Librum Isaiae*

tom. IV (Venetiis 1732) 30a
middle 13th cent.

In Evangelio Nazoraeorum, quod Hebraice scriptum est, ita habetur: Factum est, cum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis spiritus et requievit super eum, et dixit ei: Expectabam te, fili, in omnibus prophetis, ut venires et requiescerem in te: tu enim es requies mea, tu es filius meus, primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum.

In the Gospel of the Nazoraeans, which was written in Hebrew, it is put in this way: It happened when the Lord ascended from the water, that the whole fountain of the Spirit descended and rested upon him and said to him: Son, I expected you among all the prophets and I would rest upon you. For you are my rest, you are my first-born Son, who shall reign in eternity.

Commentary

Jerome wants to say that Is. 11,2 has been fulfilled at the moment of Jesus' baptism. He refers to a passage in a Jewish-Christian Gospel in order to corroborate his point. He especially emphasizes the words *Descendet super eum omnis fons Spiritus Sancti*.

The present passage can be compared to Matth. 3,16-17/Mark 1,10-11/Luke 3,21-22/John 1,32-34. The event is recounted by the author himself in the Nazorean Gospel, as it is in the synoptic Gospels, whereas in John it is John the Baptist who speaks about it to his followers.

The beginning of the passage can be compared to Mark and Matthew: ...ἀνέβη (Mark : ἀναβαίνων) ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος. The canonical Gospels say that at that moment the heavens were opened and that a dove appeared. This is missing in this Gospel where we read: *Descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti, et requieavit super eum*. This might be compared to John 1,32: καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτὸν, but the words are more in agreement with Is. 11,2: καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν τυεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ... We also see that here and in the canonical Gospels there is mention of a voice but in the New Testament it looks like a *bath kol*, whereas in the present passage it is the Spirit who is speaking. The words *Fili mi* can be found both in the canonical Gospels and in the quotation. But from here on the traditions differ considerably.

The Jewish-Christian Gospel goes its own way although the general structure of the passage is the same as in the canonical Gospels.

Next we shall look at some aspects of detail. The expression *fons omnis Spiritus Sancti* requires our attention. The word *fons Spiritus* can be compared to expressions such as "source of life", *fons vitae* and πηγὴ ζωῆς, cf. Ps. 36,10; Jer. 2,13; 17,13; John 4,14 and Rev. 21,6, or "source of wisdom", *fons sapientiae*, πηγὴ τῆς σοφίας, cf. Bar. 3,12. The underlying idea is that life, Spirit and wisdom originate in one place and spread out.⁹⁶ This means that, according to this quotation, the Spirit may have been spread out over more than one person. However, at the moment of Jesus' baptism it is again gathered together in one place. This striking event was also discussed by Justin Martyr in his debate with Trypho. Trypho wonders whether Is. 11,1-3 speaks with reference to Jesus, who, according to Justin is supposed to be God. Justin answers that Jesus lacked nothing "but as being about to make their (scil. the powers of the Spirit) rest permanently upon him; that is to come to an end with him, that there should be no longer prophets in your nation" (ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπ' ἔκεινον ἀνάπαυσιν μελλουσῶν ποιεῖσθαι, τούτεστιν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ πέρας ποιεῖσθαι, τοῦ μηκέτι ἐν τῷ γένει ὑμῶν κατὰ τὸ πολαῖον ἔθος προφήταις γενήσθαι...). This means that the powers are not longer spread over various people but that they "had taken their rest in Christ" (καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἀνάπαυσιν λαβόντα πάλιν).⁹⁷

⁹⁶ See Michaelis, s.v. πηγὴ, *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T.* VI, 112-117.

⁹⁷ *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 87 3-5, ed. E.J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen 1914) 201.

A similar idea is known from Tertullian, *adv. Judaeos* VII 14, who writes: *Baptizato enim Christo id est sanctificante aquas in suo baptismate, omnis plenitudo spiritalium retro charismatum in Christo cessauit signante uisiones et prophetias omnes, quae aduentu suo adimpleuit.*⁹⁸

The Jewish-Christian Gospel appears to represent not only a Jewish-Christian idea but one that is characteristic of early Christianity in general.

We have already referred to the parallel between the words *requieuit super eum* in John 1,32 on the one hand and Is. 11,2 on the other. We noted that Justin Martyr also spoke of a relation between Is. 11 and Jesus' Baptism. The same parallel is noted in Ephrem's Commentary on the Diatessaron which reads: "The Spirit which rested upon him during his baptism... Many were baptised on that day but the Spirit descended and rested upon only one..."⁹⁹

We also noted above that in the present quotation it is the Spirit who is speaking. Jesus is addressed with the words *Fili me* which makes Jesus the son of the Spirit and the Spirit his Mother. This conclusion appears to be in agreement with the text of a similar passage quoted by Origen (see III).

The expression *in omnibus prophetis expectabam te* is typical of Wisdom literature, where the following parallels can be found: "Among them all, I was looking for a place of rest. In whose heritage shall I dwell?" (Sir. 24,7) and "...from generation to generation she (*scil.* Wisdom) enters into the souls and makes them God's friends and prophets..." (*Sap. Sal.* 7,27).

We see that the quotation begins with Is. 11,1-3 but that it adopts elements of Wisdom theology. This gives to Jesus' baptism the elements of a prophetic call. A close parallel can be found in Ps. Clement, where it is said that the Redeemer will go through the world from the beginning of creation until the moment that he is anointed because of his labor by God's mercy and that he will find eternal rest.¹⁰⁰

The words *filius primogenitus* are the same as the Greek words ὁ γιὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, found in the synoptic Gospels in the passages that speak of Jesus' baptism. Both *primogenitus* and ἀγαπητός have to be explained on the basis of the Hebrew זָקֵן.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ ed. A. Kroyman, *Q.S.F. Tertulliani Opera*, Pars II, *CCSL* II (Turnholti 1954) 1362.

⁹⁹ See L. Leloir, *Éphrem de Nisibe, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant ou Diatessaron. Traduit du Syriaque et de l'Arménien, Sourc. Chrét.* 121 (Paris 1966) 94-95, in the Armenian version only. Also G. Winkler *Ein bedentsamer Zusammenhang zwischen der Erkenntnis und Ruhe in Mt 11,27-29 und dem Ruhen des Geistes auf Jesus am Jordan. Eine Analyse zur Geist-Christologie in syrischen und armenischen Quellen, Le Muséon* 96 (1983) 267-326, esp. 293-302.

¹⁰⁰ Ps. Clement, *Hom.* III 20 2, ed. Rehm-Irmscher-Paschke, *GCS* (Berlin 1969) 64: τὰ δὲ μέγιστα εὐσεβεῖ, ἕαν ἐτέφη μὲν μὴ δῆ ἔχειν, ἔκεινον δὲ μάρνον ἔχειν λέγη διὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αἰώνος ἡμας τοὺς ὄντας μόρφας ἀλλάσσον τὸν αἰώνα τρέχει μέχρις ὅτε ιδίων χρόνων τυχῶν, διὰ τοὺς καμάτους θεοῦ ἐλέει χρισθείς, εἰς ᾧτε ἔχει τὴν ἀνάτανον, cf. *Recogn.* VI 22 4, ed. Rehm-Paschke, *GCS* (Berlin 1965) 65: ...nam et ipse verus propheta ab initio mundi per saeculum currens festinat ad requiem.

¹⁰¹ See C.H. Turner, *O ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ, JTS* 27 (1936) 113-129, esp. p. 119: "From Homer to Athanasius the history of the Greek language bears out, I venture to think, the argument of this paper that ἀγαπητός ὁ γιὸς is rightly rendered 'Only Son'"; F. Lentzen *Deis, Die*

Finally we read the words *qui regnas in sempiternum* which must be understood in terms of the Spirit which has found eternal rest. This is a specifically Messianic expectation which is also present in Luke 1,33 which reads: καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακὼβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. The idea of "reigning" is also present in reference I.

The text of this passage is clear and consistent. Jesus' baptism is described as the beginning of his prophetic work. The sign of this is the gift of the Spirit. The background of this idea is closely related to Jewish wisdom theology.

XXII

Jerome, *Comment. in Hiezechiel 18,5-9*

ed. F. Glorie, *Commentariorum in Hiezechiel Libri XIV, CCSL LXXV* (Turnholti 1964) 237
410/14

Source: Gospel according to the Hebrews

et in euangelio quod iuxta Hebraeos Nazaraei legere consuerunt, inter maxima ponitur crimina: qui fratri sui spiritum contristauerit.

and in the Gospel which is according to the Hebrews which the Nazoraeans are accustomed to read, among the worst crimes is set he who has distressed the spirit of his brother.

Commentary

This passage can be compared with that in Jerome's Commentary on Ephesians (XIV). Both passages speak of the relation with one's brother and both show that behind this *logion* a community existed which was obviously of an introspective character.

Jerome quotes this passage in connection with Ez. 18,8-9 and especially 18,7 of which the following words are important: לֹא יְרִא אֶת יְהוָה which was translated in the LXX by οὐ μὴ καταδυναστεύσῃ, in Aquila by θλίψῃ, in Theodotion by κακώσῃ and in Symmachus with ὁδυνήσῃ. The last translation is of some importance because here we again meet the word *contristauerit* of the present *logion*.¹⁰²

Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern, *Frankf. Theol. Stud.* 4 (Frankfurt am Main 1970) 187-191, and R. Pesch, *Das Markus-Evangelium, Herders Theol. Kommentar* II 1 (Freiburg 1976) 92-94. See for the final prophet or final redeemer of Israel as God's "Only Son" Ex. 4,22; Jer. 31,9 and Ps. 132,13-14.

¹⁰² See H. J. Schoeps, *Symmachusstudien. A. Spuren ebionitischer Theologoumena in seiner Übersetzung, Aus frühchristlicher Zeit* (Tübingen 1950) 82-89, but also Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 332.

With regard to the meaning of the passage there are two possibilities. The first is that the word *spiritus* means "soul" and the second that the word has to be taken as meaning Holy Spirit or the human spirit.

For the first possibility we can refer to an expression like περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή σου in Matth. 26,38/Mark 14,34 which has been derived from Ps. 42,6.12 and 43,5. A similar warning is found in Rom. 14,15: εἰ γὰρ διὰ βρῶμα δὲ ἀδελφός σου λυπεῖται...

On the other hand the idea of mourning the Holy Spirit is not uncommon in early Christian literature. We may refer to Eph. 4,30: καὶ μὴ λυπεῖσθαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον. The words of 1 Thessal. 5,19: τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σφέννυτε are related to the same idea. A few other passages show that mourning the Holy Spirit is particularly objectionable. We may refer to Hermas, *mand* X 2 5: μὴ θλίψε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον τὸ ἐν σοι, and X 3 2: ὃ δὲ λυπήρος ἀντὶ πάντοτε πουνηρεύεται· πρῶτον μὲν πουνηρεύεται ὅτι λυπεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον τὸ δοθὲ ν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ λαρόν· δεύτερον δὲ λυπῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἀνομίαν ἐργάζεται...,¹⁰³ and also to Cyprian, *de aleat.* 3: *Monet Dominus et dicit: Nolite contristare spiritum sanctum qui in vobis est et nolite extinguere lumen quod in vobis effuslit.*

From this it appears that the second possibility has to be preferred.¹⁰⁴

XXIII

Jerome, *adv. Pelagianos* III 2

ed. Migne, *PL* 23, 597B-598A

415

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoreans

In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed Habraicis litteris scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autunnant, juxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca, narrat historia: Ecce, mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: Joannes Baptisma baptizat in remissionem peccatorum: eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi, ut vadem et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi, ignorantia est.

In the Gospel according to the Hebrews which was written in the Chaldaic and Syriac language but with Hebrew letters, and is used up to the present day by

¹⁰³ We wonder whether we can speak of a proper parallel passage since in Hermas, *mand.* X, the subject deals with sadness in general which is a vice that has to be rejected and is the cause of all kinds of unfortunate consequences.

¹⁰⁴ See also A. Harnack, Über einige Worte Jesu, die nicht in den kanonischen Evangelien stehen, *Sitz. ber. der königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin 1903) 170-208, esp. 173-174.

the Nazoreans, I mean that according to the Apostles, or, as many maintain, according to Matthew, which Gospel is also available in the Library of Caesarea, the story runs: See, the mother of the Lord and his brothers said to him: John the Baptist baptizes for the remission of sins, let us go to be baptized by him. He said to them, however: What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized by him ? Unless perhaps something which I said in ignorance.

Commentary

Jerome quotes a passage from a Jewish-Christian Gospel in a passage about the sinlessness of Jesus. He thought that this Gospel assumed that Jesus was without sin and that, for this reason, it was not necessary for him to be baptized by John. Jesus himself is supposed to have maintained this conviction even in the face of his mother and his brothers. We shall discuss the text of the quotation presently.¹⁰⁵

First we shall look at a text ascribed to Cyprian with the title *de Rebaptismate* in which we find a similar story. The text reads as follows:¹⁰⁶ *Est autem adulterini huius immo intermecini baptismatis si qui alias auctor, tum etiam quidam ab eisdem ipsis haereticis propter hunc eundem errorem conflictus liber qui inscribitur Pauli Praedicatio, in quo liber contra omnes scripturas et de peccato proprio confidentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquerit et ad accipendum Ioannis baptismata paene invitum a matre sua Maria esse compulsum, item cum baptizaretur ignem super aquam esse visum, quod in evangelio nullo est scriptum, et post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum post conlationem evangelii in Hierusalem et mutuam cogitationem altercationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem postremo in urbe quasi tunc primum invicem sibi esse cognitos, et quaedam alia huicmodi absurde ac turpiter conficta, quae omnia in illum librum invenies congesta.*

The author of this piece¹⁰⁷ wants to show three absurdities which can be found in *Pauli Praedicatio*. In the first place it is said that Mary urged Jesus to have Himself baptized by John, although He was without sin. In the second place it is said that fire appeared at the moment of Jesus' baptism and in the third place it is said that Paul and Peter did not meet earlier than in Rome.

The first statement can be compared with the present passage, the second has already been dealt with in connection with IX. The third remark does not

¹⁰⁵ Julianus Eclani, quoted by Augustine, *Opus imperf. c. Julianum* IV 88, Migne, *PL* 45, 1389, reproaches Jerome for having used the "fifth Gospel" which, according to him, shows that Jesus sinned even willfully. See also Gospel acc. to Thomas I. 104: "...which then is the sin that I have committed."

¹⁰⁶ ed. G. Rauschen, *Pseudo-Cyprian, De Rebaptismate* 17, *Florilegium Patriticum XI* (Bonnae 1906) 71.

¹⁰⁷ According to Harnack, *Gesch. der altchr. Lit* I 2, 718-719, the author of this work lived in the third century, also in Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.* II, 499-502, who wrote that it was written in Mauretania.

agree with Gal. 1,18 and 2,9, where it is said that Paul had already met Peter in Jerusalem at a very early date. This would mean that this idea originated within a group that did not know the Pauline Epistles.

It appears that the three remarks can be explained on the basis of knowledge of Jewish-Christian traditions. It is clear that the passage quoted by Jerome does not depend on the text of *Pauli Praedicatio* because it is much longer. We can also assume that the text of this passage is more complicated. *Pauli Praedicatio* seems to say that Jesus was thought to have sinned. This is according to the author of *de Baptismate* an absurdity and it is, for this reason, that he refers to this story. It seems, however, that Jerome quoted the passage because he thought that it showed, on the contrary, that Jesus was without sin even according to a Jewish-Christian Gospel. We now have to determine which of the two is correct.

The passage starts with the remark that the mother of Jesus and his brothers invited Jesus to go with them to John the Baptist so that they could be baptized for the forgiveness of sins. The canonical Gospels do not say anything about such an invitation. Jesus' answer seems to be evident: It is not necessary for me to be baptized because I have committed no sin. The answer seems to be perfectly clear and is in agreement with the orthodox view. But the Nazorean Gospel adds a restriction: *nisi forte hoc ipsum ignorantia est*. The meaning of these words depends on the words *nisi forte*. Lagrange assumed that we are dealing with "une interrogation qui comportait une réponse négative"¹⁰⁸ This would mean that Jesus did not sin even *in ignorantia*.¹⁰⁹ However, we assume that the words do not exclude all possibility of Jesus sinning. Sinning *in ignorantia* is possible, although it implies "putting forward an absurd or far-fetched idea"¹¹⁰ The passage is trying to say that sins *in ignorantia* may have been committed, but that this was not likely.

What is spoken of here are voluntary and involuntary sins. The involuntary sins can be forgiven.¹¹¹ The present passage says that Jesus is certainly free of voluntary sins but the presence of involuntary sins cannot be entirely excluded.

The conclusion is that according to this passage it was not necessary for Jesus to be baptized. However, it also says that nobody knows whether Jesus could not have committed sin *in ignorantia*. This is a restriction which was overlooked by the author of *de Rebaptismate*. It was ignored by Jerome.

¹⁰⁸ See Langrange, L'Évangile selon les Hébreux 333.

¹⁰⁹ See G. Quispel, L'Évangile selon Thomas, *Vig. Christ* 13 (1959) 87-117, esp. 104.

¹¹⁰ See *Oxford Latin Dict.*, s.v. *nisi*, 1179.

¹¹¹ See G. F. Moore, *Judaism* I (Cambridge 1927) 463-469, see also Lev. 4,2 and 5,18b.

XXIV

Jerome, *adv. Pelagianos* III 2

The text continues after XXIII

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoreans

Et in eodem volumine: Si peccaverit, inquit, frater tuus in verbo, et satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum. Dixit illi Simon discipulus ejus: Septies in die? Respondit Dominus et dixit ei: Etiam ego dico tibi usque septuagies septies. Etenim in prophetis quoque postquam uncti sunt Spiritu Sancto, inventus est sermo peccati.

And in the same volume: If your brother, he said, sinned to you with a word and makes amends to you, accept him seven times a day. Simon his disciple said to him: Seven times a day? The Lord answered and said to him: And I say to you until seventy times seven. For even among the prophets after they were anointed with the Holy Spirit there was found a word of sin.

Parallel Text

Codex Novi Testamenti 566

Leningrad, Public Library, Gr. 54
9th/10th cent.

Codex Novi Testamenti 899

Uppsala, Univ. 4, Sparvenfeld 45
11th cent.

ad Matth. 18,22: Τὸ 'Ιουδαικὸν ἔξῆς ἔχει μετὰ τὸ ἐβδομηκοντάκις ἐπτά· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις μετὰ τὸ χρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ εὑρίσκετο ἐν αὐτοῖς λόγος ἀμαρτίας.

The Jewish (Gospel) reads further after seventy seven: For among the prophets after they were anointed with the Holy Spirit there was found a word of sin.

Commentary

The *logion* can be compared to the passages in Matth. 18, 21-22 and Luke 17, 3-4 which read as follows: Matthew Τότε προσελθὼν ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Κύριε, ποσάκις ἀμαρτήσει εἰς ἐμὲ ὃ ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀφήσω αὐτῷ; ἔως ἐπτάκις; λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οὐ λέγω σοι ἔως ἐπτάκις, ἀλλὰ ἔως ἐβδομηκοντάκις ἐπτά. Luke Ἐὰν ἀμαρτάνῃ ὃ ἀδελφός σου ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔὰν μετανοήσῃ ἀφες, αὐτῷ. Καὶ ἔὰν ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ καὶ ἐπτάκις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ λέγων· μετανοῶ, ἀφήσεις αὐτῷ.

The passage in Jerome consists of three parts. The first part is a *logion* about forgiving one's brother seven times a day. The second part recounts Simon's question about the word *septies*. The answer is that one has to be prepared to forgive seventy times seven. The third part gives the reason for this statement: Even the prophets were sinners. Part one and two can be compared to the passages in Matthew and Luke. The third part reveals an independent Gospel tradition and is referred to in the manuscripts 566 and 899.

The reference seems to be a composite of Luke and Matthew. The first part agrees with Luke in its introduction 'Εὰν ἀμαρτάνῃ ὁ ἀδελφός and also to the words ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας. The second part agrees with Matthew as far the introduction of Simon (Peter) and the remark about forgiving seventy times seven are concerned. The question of Peter in Matthew, ἔως ἐπτάκις, receives a plausible reason in the *logion* according to Luke. The third part becomes an argument *a minore ad maius*.

The passage is not harmonistic in the proper sense of the word like its parallel in the *Diatessaron*.¹¹² We assume that the author had used both Matthew and Luke. Since the text of Luke is supposed to be the same as the underlying source of both Gospels¹¹³ we cannot exclude the possibility that this source was used.¹¹⁴

The following can be said about the passage. The words *in verbo* cannot be found in Luke and serve to introduce the phrase in the final sentence: *sermo peccati*. It is evident that what the passage is referring to are the "sins of the tongue". This is typically Jewish and Jewish-Christian as is apparent in James 3,1-12 and passages such as Sir. 19,16: "...whose tongue is always free from guilt"; 25,8: "Happy...the man whose tongue never betrays him", and Aboth I 17: "R.Simon: And everyone who speaks many words, is open to sin".¹¹⁵

The word "brother" is also present in Luke but the idea that this warning is especially meant for the writer's group is also characteristic of other references to Jewish-Christian Gospels (see III, XIV and XXII).

Matthew speaks of Peter but here talk is of Simon, which is the name that can be found often in these references (see III, XXXIV and XLII).

Finally, the prophets are examples of those who sin even though they have been anointed with the Holy Spirit. This does not mean to say that they have

¹¹² This applies to the various editions of the *Diatessaron*, see Plooy, *The Liège Diatessaron* 309-310. Here we find the text of Matthew into which some elements taken from Luke has been added, like the words *in die*.

¹¹³ See S. Schulz, *Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich 1972) 320-322, esp. 321: "Der Dialog zwischen Petrus und Jesus in 18,21f ist deutlich sek(undär) und von Mt gestaltet".

¹¹⁴ See J. Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte* (Gütersloh 1983²) 90, n. 166: "Dass das Lukasevangelium selbst benutzt ist, ist ganz unwahrscheinlich", although this is stated without any argument.

¹¹⁵ See Jeremias, *o.c.*, 90, n.167, and F. Mussner, *Der Jakobusbrief*, *Herders Theol. Komm. z N.T.* XIII 1 (Freiburg 1975) 157-168: "Warnung vor Lehrsucht wegen der Dämonen der Zunge".

been rejected.¹¹⁶ On the contrary they have received the same gift that has been given to Christians. However, one cannot say that they have never committed a *sermo peccati* which means the same as *תְּמִילָה* or *תְּמִילָה*.¹¹⁷

The expression can be explained in three ways. It may be “the word of sin”, “a sinful word” or “a sinful deed”. The choice lies between the last two possibilities. We prefer the translation “a sinful word”, because of the phrase in the introduction *in verbo*.¹¹⁸

XXV

Codex Novi Testamenti 566

Leningrad, Public Library, Gr. 54
9th/10th cent.

Source: Gospel of the Nazoreans

ad Matth. 4,5 Τὸ 'Ιουδαικὸν οὐκ ἔχει· εἰς τὴν ἀγίαν πόλιν, ἀλλ' ἐν 'Ιερουσαλήμ

The Jewish (Gospel) has not the holy city, but to (or: in) Jerusalem.

Commentary

The variant reading¹¹⁹ can be compared to the text of the Liège Diatessaron which reads : “Doe namene die euelgheest en uurdene in de stat van iherl'm” (Then the evil spirit took him and carried him into the city of Jerusalem).¹²⁰ Both readings avoid speaking of the “holy city” which is explicable on the basis of anti-Judaic attitudes. However, whether the two readings are immediately related is difficult to decide since the agreement is not exact.¹²¹

¹¹⁶ Contrary to Schoeps, *Theologie* 159-169, esp. 167, and the same, Review *Jeremias Unbekannte...*, *Deutsche Literaturz.* 72 (1956) 289-291, esp. 290-291.

¹¹⁷ See Zach. 7,12; Num. 24,2; 2 Sam. 23,2; Jes. 6,1; Joel 2,18 etc., see W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (Leipzig 1905, Darmstadt 1965) II, 202-206.

¹¹⁸ J. B. Bauer, *Sermo Peccati*. Hieronymus und das Nazareerevangelium. *Bibl. Zeitschr.* n.F. 4 (1960) 122-126, prefers “sinful deed”, also Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 334 and 339, contrary to Jeremias, *Unbekannte...*, 90, n.167: “sündige Rede”.

¹¹⁹ The marginal note adds the following words ὡ[ς] κ[αὶ] ὁ λ' ψ[αλμός], see also Zahn, *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons* II, 648, n.1, and Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* 165, n.1, which applies to Ps. 30,22: ἐν πόλει περιοχῆς.

¹²⁰ See D. Plooy, *A further Study of the Liège Diatessaron* (Leyden 1925) 84-85, and also G. J. Reinink, *Neue Fragmente zum Diatessaronkommentar des Ephraemschüler Aba*, *Orient. Lovan. Periodica* 11 (1980) 117-133, esp. 132-133.

¹²¹ A similar tendency we notice in Dan. 9,24, where the words “for your Holy City” have been translated in the LXX: ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν Σιων, in Theodotion: ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἀγίαν σου, cf. also 2 Macc. 2,14 in the LXX: τὴν μὲν ἀγίαν πόλιν, but in the Vulgate: *et civitatem*. See also P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?* (Oxford 1990) 325-330: Holy Jerusalem, and 358-368.

XXVI

Codex Novi Testamenti 1424

Maywood, Illinois, Theol. Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, MS. 152
9th/10th cent.

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoreans

ad Matth. 5,22 Τὸ εἰκῇ ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις οὐ κεῖται οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαικῷ

The (word) without reason is not present in some manuscripts and also not in the Jewish (Gospel)

Commentary

In Codex 1424 the word εἰκῇ is present in Math. 5,22 which agrees with the Manuscripts of the Byzantine Text. The word is also present in the Manuscripts Χ² D W Θ f.1 and f.13, it sȳ sa bo Ir Or^{pt} Cyr.

Jerome read a text without the word in his Commentary on Matthew but writes *Quibusdam codicibus additur sine causa*.¹²²

XXVII

Codex Novi Testamenti 1424

Source: Gospel of the Nazoreans

ad Matth. 7,5 Τὸ Ἰουδαικὸν ἐνταῦθα οὔτως ἔχει· ἐὰν ἦτε ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου καὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς μὴ ποιῆτε, ἐκ τοῦ κόλπου μου ἀπορρίψω ὑμᾶς

The Jewish (Gospel) has the following there: If you are in my bosom and you do not the will of my Father in heaven I shall throw you away from my bosom.

Commentary

In the manuscript the reference seems to be to Matth. 7,5 but this is not a very appropriate parallel. For this reason some scholars assume that reference is to

Jerusalem, A Holy City?

¹²² See ed.D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, CCSL LXXVII (Turnholti 1969) 27-28.

Matth. 7,23. But this is also difficult to assume. We can only say that the reference must have been present in a Jewish-Christian Gospel but that the parallel text in Matthew is unknown.¹²³

A similar *logion* is known from 2 Clement 4,5 which reads: 'Εὰν ἦτε μετ' ἔμοι συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου καὶ μὴ ποιήτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς.

The following can be said about the two passages. The phrase ἦτε μετ' ἔμοι συνηγμένοι in 2 Clement does not differ much from the simple ἦτε. In 2 Clement we read τὰς ἐντολάς μου, but in our *logion*: τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου. This means that 2 Clement is referring to the commandments of Jesus and our quotation to those of the Father. The expression τὰς ἐντολάς μου can only be found in John 14,15; 15,10 and 12 and τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός in Matth. 7,12; 12,50; 21,31, cf. John 6,40. If the word κόλπος is to be Johannine as some scholars assume¹²⁴ we might say that the text of 2 Clement is the original and that our quotation shows Matthaean influence.¹²⁵

The final words read in 2 Clement ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς and in our quotation ἀπορρίψω ὑμᾶς. Neither ἀποβαλλῶ, cf. Mark 10,50 and Hebr. 10,35, nor ἀπορρίπτω, cf. Acts 17,43, is found frequently in the New Testament. In the LXX the word ἀπορρίπτω is sometimes used but then followed by ἐκ πρόσωπου μου. The word ἀποβάλλω is, on the contrary, rarely used in the LXX.¹²⁶

An interdependence of the passage in 2 Clement and our quotation is not apparent. We must assume that the *logion* which has a general character circulated in various forms and that this might be due to the availability of different translations of an originally Aramaic text.¹²⁷

XXVIII

Codex Novi Testamenti 1424

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoreans

ad Matth. 10,16 Τὸ 'Ιουδαικὸν ὑπὲρ ὄφεις

The Jewish (Gospel): more than serpents

¹²³ See Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* 39, but also R. Bultmann, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen 1964)⁶ 98 and 122-123.

¹²⁴ See R. Meyer, s.v. κόλπος, *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T.* III, 824-826; Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 337, and Vielhauer, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher I³, 94.

¹²⁵ See K. P. Donfried, *The Setting of Second Clement in early Christianity, Suppl. to Nov. Test.* XXXVIII (Leiden 1974) 66.

¹²⁶ See Ps. 70 (71), 9, in place of ἀπορρίπτω in the other Greek translations.

¹²⁷ See Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* 337.

Commentary

The text of Matth. 10,16 reads: φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὅφεις καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστέραι. If the same passage were found in the Jewish-Christian Gospel we could expect the second ὡς to be also read as ὑπὲρ.

The word ὑπὲρ has the meaning of ἡ in Greek, although the word usually follows the comparative form of an adjective as in Luke 16,8 φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ; John 12,43; Hebr. 4,12; *Martyrium Polycarpi* 18,1 and Barnabas 5,9 or the superlative form as in *Pastor Hermae* 5,1,6. But in IV Ezra which was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic we find in VII 25: *nostrae facies super tenebras nigrae* and X 6: *beatus es p[re] multis*. The influence of the Hebrew יְהָוָה is clearly visible.

XXIX

Codex Novi Testamenti 1424

Source: The Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

ad Matth. 11,12 Τὸ 'Ιουδαικὸν διαρπάζεται ἔχει

The Jewish (Gospel) has: he robs

Commentary

The passage in the New Testament reads: ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτὴν. We must assume that the reference is to the word βιάζεται which was read as διαρπάζεται. There seems to be a slight difference in meaning between the two words.¹²⁸ The influence of Matth. 12,29/Mark 3,27 is possible: τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει. The result of this is that the meaning of διαρπάζεται in the first and ἀρπάζουσι in the second part of the passage appear to have been the same in the Jewish-Christian Gospel.

XXX

Codex Novi Testamenti 1424

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

¹²⁸ See E. Moore, ΒΙΑΖΩ, ΑΡΠΑΖΩ and Cognates in Josephus, *NTS* 21 (1974/5) 519-543, esp. 526: "...one gets the impression that διαρπάζω like ἀρπάζω, is a characteristic activity of the ... 'rebels' or 'insurgents'..."

ad Matth. 11,25 Τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν εὐχαριστῶ σε

The Jewish (Gospel): I thank you

Commentary

In Matth. 11,25/Luke 10,21 the word ἔξομολήγεται was used with the meaning of "to praise" or "to thank". This is the only place in the New Testament apart from Romans 14,11 and 15,9 where it is found. However, both passages are quotations from the Old Testament. This means that we can call ἔξομολογοῦμαι a Septuagintism.¹²⁹

The identity of ἔξομολογοῦμαι and εὐχαριστῶ was well known in the early Church, as is clear in Origen: ἡ ἔξομολόγησις τὴν εὐχαριστίαν καὶ δοξολογίαν σημαίνει,¹³⁰ and Jerome: *Confessio non semper paenitentiam sed et gratiarum actionem significat ut in psalmis saepissime legimus.*¹³¹ The word εὐχαριστῶ was held to be better Greek than ἔξομολογοῦμαι. We can assume that the use of *Gratias...ago et confiteor* in Marcion, according to Tertullian¹³² and εὐχαριστῶ in Epiphanius¹³³ and Origen¹³⁴ is not due to the influence of Jewish-Christian traditions but is merely to an effort to write better Greek. More interesting is the reading "I thank you" in the Liège Diatessaron and the Venetian Diatessaron,¹³⁵ but also here it is difficult to be certain of the influence of a Jewish-Christian tradition.

Thus we can conclude that it is possible to explain the use of *εὐχαριστῶ* in this reference in that this word is better Greek. But, on the other hand, one could also argue that we have here an Aramaic source which has been translated into Greek.¹³⁶

¹²⁹ See A. F. J. Klijn, Matthew 11,25/Luke 10,21, *New Testament Textual Criticism, its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of B. M. Metzger* (Oxford 1981) 5-14.

¹³⁰ Origen, *Sel. in Psalmos* 135, 2, Migne, PG 12, 1653D, see also *de Oratione* 15,4, ed. P. Koetschau, GCS, Origenes II, 333: ἔξομολογούμαται ἵστι ἐστὶ τῷ εὐχαριστῷ.

¹³¹ Jerome, *Comment. ad Matth.* 11,25, ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, CCSL LXXVII (Turnholt 1969) 85.

¹³² Tertullianus, *adv. Marcionem* 4.25.1, ed. A. Kroymann, *Q.S.F. Tertulliani Opera*, Pars II, *CCSL* II (Turnholti 1954) 610.

¹³³ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 40.79, ed. K. Holl, *GCS*, Epiphanius II, 89, 1-2.

¹³⁴ Origen, fr. 239 in *Matth.* 11,25, ed. E. Klostermann, *GCS*, Origenes XII, 112, and *Horn.* 14,4 in *Num.*, ed. W. A. Baehrrens, *GCS*, Origenes VII, 127, see also Des Petrus von Laodicea Erklärung des Matthäusevangelium, ed. G. Heinrici, *Beitr.z.Gesch. u. Erkl. des N.T.* V (Leipzig 1908) 126.

¹³⁵ ed. Plooy, *The Liège Diatessaron*, 153, and *Il Diatessaron in Volgare Italiano*, ed. V. Todesco, P. A. Vaccari, M. Vattasso, *Studi e Testi* 81 (Roma 1938) 63.

¹³⁶ Ephrem in his Commentary on the Diatessaron reads ~~καὶ τὰς~~ but this does not say anything about the text of the Diatessaron because no other word can be used in Syriac.

XXXI

Codex Novi Testamenti 899

Uppsala, Univ. 4, Sparvenfeld 45
11th. cent.

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

ad Matth. 12,40 Τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν οὐκ ἔχει τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας]

The Jewish (Gospel) has not three d[ays and three nights]

Commentary

The text of Matth. 12,40 reads: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦν Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κῆπους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας.

The *scholion* is not quite clear and reads:

ΤΟ ΓΥΔ

Κ" ΟΥΚΕ

ΤΡΕΙΣ Η

Some text in the margin has been cut off but it could not have contained than the following:

ΤΟ ΙΟΔ[ΑΙ

Κ" ΟΥΚΕ[ΧΕΙ

ΤΡΕΙΣ Η[ΜΕ

It is not clear whether the phrase “three days and three nights” applies to the first or the second half of the sentence. The manuscripts of the New Testament offer no variant readings here.

The Syriac and the Armenian versions of Ephrem's Commentary on the *Diatessaron* lack in the second part of this verse the words referred to in this *scholion*. In the beginning of his Commentary on this passage he quotes it in full: “...so will be the Son of Man in the heart of the earth”.¹³⁷ Later he quotes it again: “So will be the Son of Man in the heart of the earth”, and he continues: “The Son of Man will be in the heart of the earth like Jonah in the monster”.¹³⁸ The omission of these words is not accidental because having quoted the passage at the beginning of this chapter he continues with the following words: “Speaking about it, our Lord did not care about the number of three days, but because he had cured the sick ones and had risen their dead ones”. To this we may add that chapter XX 3 of his Commentary which only survives in Armenian contains a summary of various texts taken from the New Testament, among

¹³⁷ See Saint Éphrem, *Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant XI* 1, ed. Leloir 195.

¹³⁸ See Saint Éphrem, *Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant XI* 3, ed. Leloir 197.

these we find Matth. 12,40: "As Jonah was in the womb of the fish, thus the Son of Man was in the bosom of the earth".¹³⁹

We can conclude that the text of the Diatessaron omitted the very same words referred to in the marginal note.

XXXII

Codex Novi Testamenti 1424

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

ad Matth. 15,5 Τὸ Ιουδαικὸν· κορβᾶν δὲ ὑμεῖς ὠφεληθήσεσθε ἐξ ἡμῶν

Jewish (Gospel): *korban* what we owe you

Commentary

Matthew 15,5 reads : ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε· δς ὀν εἴπη τῷ πάτερι ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· δῶρον δὲ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῆς, and Mark 7,11 : ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε· ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατερὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· κορβᾶν, δέ ἐστιν δῶρον, δὲ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελήθης.

First we consider the word *κορβᾶν*. In Matthew this word has been added to the text after *μητρὶ* in manuscript Γ. In Mark both sy^s (the passage does not survive in syc) which reads *.....* and sy^p with *.....* omit the words δέ ἐστιν δῶρον. The same happens in the Ethiopian text.

The use of *κορβᾶν* in place of δῶρον without any explanation can be explained on the basis of a Semitic original.

Next we see that the words δέ ὑμεῖς ὠφεληθήσεσθε differ from those in Matthew and Mark. The sentence is no longer conditional and no longer speaks of somebody addressing his father and mother in general. The reference is trying to say that it is *you*, i.e. the Pharisees and Scribes of verse 1, who are acting in this way. A similar idea seems to have been held by Ephrem in his Commentary on the Diatessaron¹⁴⁰ and the Letter of Ptolemy to Flora.¹⁴¹

¹³⁹ See Saint Ephrem, *Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant* XX 3, ed. Leloir 344.

¹⁴⁰ See Saint Ephrem, *Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant* XII VI 12, ed. Leloir 220: "...and everyone of you tells his father: My gift to God..."

¹⁴¹ Ptolémée, *Lettre à Flora*, ed. G. Quispel, *Sourc. Chrét.* 45, according to Epiphanius, *Panarion* 33 3 12, ed. Holl I,453: ὑμεῖς δέ, φησίν, ειρήκατε, τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις λέγων· δῶρον.

XXXIII

Codex Novi Testamenti 1424

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

ad Matth. 16,2-3 τὰ σεσημειωμένα διὰ τοῦ ἀστερίσκου ἐν ἑτεροῖς οὐκ ἔμφέρεται οὔτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαικῷ

What has been marked with a star is not given in the other ones and also not in the Jewish (Gospel)

Commentary

Manuscripts Χ Β Χ Γ f.13 ^{sy^{sc} sa b^{opt} omit the passage Matth. 16,2-3 but it is present in C D L W Θ f.1 ^{sy^{ph} b^{opt} Eus.¹⁴² Also Jerome knows this variant reading: *Hoc in plerisque codicibus non habetur*.¹⁴³}}

XXXIV

Codex Novi Testamenti 566

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

ad Matth. 16,17 Τὸ 'Ιουδαικὸν· υἱὲ 'Ιωάννου

The Jewish (Gospel): son of John

Commentary

Matth. 16,17 reads Σίμων Βαρωνά, but a number of manuscripts such as L Γ f.13 28 33 565 700 read Βαρ Ιωνα.

We have looked at this name in connection with a reference to a Jewish-Christian Gospel in the Latin translation of Origen (III). We arrived at the conclusion that the use of *filius Iona* is a Septuagintism and that *υἱὸς 'Ιωάννου* better agrees with Hebrew usage. We can repeat here that the name Σίμων ὁ *υἱὸς 'Ιωάννου* is found in John 1,43 and Σίμων 'Ιωάννου in John 21,15,16 and 17.

¹⁴² See also Reuss, *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche, Texte u. Unters.* 61 (Leipzig 1957) XXVI, who concludes from fr. 82 of Apollinaris, p.25, that this writer assumed that the passage is part of the text.

¹⁴³ Jerome, *Comment. in Matth.*, ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, CCSL LXXVII (Turnholti 1969)

XXXV

Codex Novi Testamenti 4

reading of the text, Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 14, 13th cent.; also in 273 reading of the text, Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 79, 13th cent.; 899 and 1424

Source : Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

ad Matth. 26,74 Τὸ 'Ιουδαϊκὸν· Καὶ ἤρνήσατο καὶ ὠμοσεῖν καὶ κατηράσατο

The Jewish (Gospel): And he denied and swore and cursed

Commentary

The text of Matth. 26,74 reads: Τότε ἤρξατο καταθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμιλύειν. We can only conclude that the text as given in the marginal note has been paraphrased.

XXXVI

Codex Novi Testamenti 1424

Source: Gospel according to the Nazoraeans

ad Matth. 27,65 Τὸ 'Ιουδαϊκὸν· καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἄνδρας ἐνόπλους, ἵνα καθέέζωνται κατ' ἐναντίον τοῦ σπηλαίου καὶ τηρῶσιν αὐτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτάς κουστωδίαν

The Jewish (Gospel): And he gave them armed men that they sat opposite the tomb and kept watch over him days and nights

Commentary

In Matth. 27,62-66 it is said that Pilate gave a κουστωδίαν to the Jews. In Christian tradition the presence of independent witnesses at the tomb becomes more and more important to counter the rumour that the body of Jesus was stolen.¹⁴⁴ This can also be seen in the Gospel of Peter which reads: ὁ δὲ Πειλάτος παραδέδωκεν αὐτοῖς Πειρώνιον τὸν κεντυρίωνα μετὰ στρατιωτῶν φυλάσσειν τὸν τάφον (VIII 31).

¹⁴⁴ See also Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu* 256-257.

SPURIOUS AND DOUBTFUL TEXTS

XXXVII

Eusebius, *historia ecclesiastica* III 39 17

ed. E. Schwartz (Leipzig 1955⁵) 122,8-10
325 / middle 2nd cent.

έκτέθειται (scil. Papias) δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἀμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυριοῦ, ἦν τὸ καθ' Ἐβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει

And he related another story of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord which is present in the Gospel according to the Hebrews

Commentary

Eusebius does not quote any particular passage from the Gospel according to the Hebrews but he refers to a story about "a woman accused of many sins" which would have been known to Papias and which was supposed to have been present in this Gospel.

Eusebius introduced it as "another story" which must be understood in the context of the entire chapter which Eusebius devoted to Papias (*hist. eccles.* III 39).

He begins by stating that Papias wrote a book with the title *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἔξηγησις*. Its contents seem to have been a welcome addition to ancient Christian traditions, a supplement not known to Eusebius from other sources. He summarizes some passages from the book, for example, about the origin of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew.¹⁴⁵ Next he writes in III 39 17 that Papias also used the first letter of John and the first letter of Peter. Finally, he comes to the passage referred to above.

From III 39 17 Eusebius is speaking of a special group of traditions. Unlike those mentioned earlier which were totally unknown he now speaks of

¹⁴⁵ Apart from this story Eusebius refers to two persons named John (5-6), "mythological" stories about the millennium (11-12), stories about Ariston, the disciples of Jesus and traditions about John the priest (14). See also R. M. Grant, Papias in Eusebius' Church History, *Mélanges d'Histoire des Religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris 1974) 289-313.

those that are also found in other texts. This applies to passages which can also be found in I Peter and I John. Then he mentions "another story"¹⁴⁶ about a woman accused of many sins which is also found in the Gospel to the Hebrews.

He gives the theme of the story only. That does not mean that he assumes the story to be known to his readers but rather that the story is also known from another source and for this reason is not held to be unique.

We have now to deal with two questions. Which story is intended by Eusebius and how did Eusebius become aware that the story was present in a Gospel according to the Hebrews which he, apparently, did not know?

Traditions about the life of Jesus refer to two encounters between Jesus and a sinful woman. The first is mentioned in Luke 7,36-50, but we can ignore this because it has little point to discuss a story known to Papias which was part of the canonical Gospels.¹⁴⁷ The second story, in John 7,53-8,11, concerns an adulterous woman and this was certainly not yet part of the New Testament known to Eusebius or his readers. It is only present in manuscripts of a later date.¹⁴⁸

Thus, there is reason to suppose that it is John 7,53-8,11 that is meant. However, the woman in this passage was not accused of many sins but of only one, viz. adultery.¹⁴⁹

Before we come to the conclusion that Eusebius cannot have been speaking of the story in John we have to say that a number of variant readings show that more than one version of this story existed. In the manuscripts D and 1071 we read in John 8,3: ἔγειρον δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι ἐπὶ ἀμαρτίᾳ γυναικα in place of ...ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ... The Syriac *Didascalia* speak of "a woman who sinned".¹⁵⁰ Two mediaeval versions of the *Diatessaron* say that a wife was "caught in unchaste acts".¹⁵¹ This means that some of the introductions

¹⁴⁶ The words "another story" refers to the stories mentioned earlier in this chapter, see U. Becker, *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin. Untersuchungen zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte von Joh. 7,53-8,3, Beihefte zur ZNW* 28 (Berlin 1963) 92, contrary to M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Paris 1948)⁸ 225: "Outre l'histoire bien connue de la pécheresse, Papias en raconte une autre qui est dans l'évangile selon les Hébreux". This is rejected by U. H. J. Körtner, *Papias von Hierapolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums*, *FRLANT* 113 (Göttingen 1983) 302, n.32.

¹⁴⁷ See Becker, *o.c.*, 98.

¹⁴⁸ The evidence for the presence or the absence of this passage in John has been brought together by Becker, *o.c.*, 9-43.

¹⁴⁹ The Latin translation of Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* by Rufinus reads however: *simul et historiam quondam subiungit de muliere adultera, quae accusata est a Judeis apud dominum. Habetur autem in evangelia, quod dicitur secundum Hebreos, scripta parabola*, see Becker, *o.c.*, 93. It is out of the question that Rufinus is thought to have a better knowledge of this passage.

¹⁵⁰ See the *Didascalia* in English f. 26b, ed. M. Dunlop Gibson, *Horae Semiticae* II (London 1903) 39: "...that woman who had sinned, her whom the elders placed before him...", cf. *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, ed. F.X. Funk, vol.I (Paderborn 1905) II 24 6,93: ἐτέρων δέ των ἡμαρτηκίων ἔστησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ. We have reason to suppose that these texts immediately depend upon a text like that of John.

¹⁵¹ In the *Diatessaron* of Stuttgart and the Hague: "die bevinden was in onkuscheden", see The Liège *Diatessaron*, ed. Plooy, 429-430.

to the story spoke of a "sin" and some of even more than one.

New evidence has come to light in a Commentary on Ecclesiasticus written by Didymus the Blind.¹⁵² The text reads as follows: φέρομεν οὖν ἐν τισιν εὐαγγελίοις· γυνή, φησίν, κατεκρίθη ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπὶ ἀμαρτίᾳ καὶ ὑπεστέλλατο λιθοβοληθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου εἰώθει γίνεσθαι ὁ σωτήρ, φησίν, ἐωρακώς αὐτὴν καὶ θεωρήσας ὅτι ἔτοιμοι εἰσιν πρὸς τὸ λιθοβολῆσαι αὐτὴν, τοῖς μέλλουσιν αὐτὴν καταβαλεῖν λίθους εἴπειν· δος οὐκ ἡμαρτεῖν, αἱρέτω λίθουν καὶ βαλέτω αὐτὸν. εἴ τις σύνοιδεν ἔστω τὸ μὴ ἡμαρτηκέναι, λαβὼν λίθουν παισάτω αὐτὴν. καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμησεν ἐπιστήσαντες ἔστοις καὶ γυνότες, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπεύθυνοι εἰσιν τισιν, οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν καταπταῖσαι ἔκεινην. The following translation can be given: "We find in certain Gospels: A woman, it says, was condemned by the Jews for a sin and was being sent to be stoned in a place where that was customary to happen. The Saviour, it says, when he saw her and observed that they were ready to stone her said to those who were about to cast stones: He who has not sinned let him take a stone and cast it. If anyone is conscious in himself of not having sinned, let him take a stone and smite her. And no one dared. Since they they know in themselves and perceived that they themselves were guilty in some things, they did not dare to strike her".

We shall look at this passage in as far as it is necessary to our present purpose. It is said that the story is found "in certain Gospels". This does not mean to say that it is found "in certain manuscripts" of the Gospels.¹⁵³ But if it was known by Didymus because it was present in his Gospel of John, which is highly improbable, it must have also been present in other, i.e. apocryphal Gospels.¹⁵⁴ In the second place we see a number of deviations from the story in the Gospel of John. Nothing is said about the nature of the sin which was committed by the woman and secondly we note that Jesus was not involved in her judgment but in her execution only.

It is impossible to conclude that the story is a summary of the passage known from John. This is a different version. This means that the question of whether Eusebius knew John 7,53-8,11 or not is inappropriate. It appears that more than one version of a woman accused of a sin or sins was circulating.¹⁵⁵

This means that we have no reason to reject the conclusion that Papias

¹⁵² See J. Kramer u. B. Krebber, *Didymus der Blinde. Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes IV, 223,7-13, Paläologische Texte und Abhandlungen* 16 (Bonn 1972) 88. The emendations of this edition have been followed.

¹⁵³ See Kramer u. Krebber, o.c., 89: "Wir finden z.B. in einigen Handschriften der Evangelien die folgende Geschichte...". This is rejected by B. D. Ehrman, *Jesus and the Adulteress*, *NTS* 34 (1988) 24-44, esp. 26, and D. Lührmann, *Die Geschichte von einer Sünderin und andere Apokryphe Jesusüberlieferungen bei Didymus von Alexandrien*, *Nov. Test.* 37 (1990) 289-316, 291.

¹⁵⁴ The manuscript 1006 of the New Testament adds to the text of John 7,53: τὸ κεφάλαιον τοῦτο (scil. 7,53-9,11) τοῦ κατὰ θωμᾶν εὐαγγελίου ἔστι, see Becker, o.c., 11.

¹⁵⁵ See Lührmann, *art. cit.*, 297.

was acquainted with some version or other of this story.¹⁵⁶ However, the contents of this version remain unknown to us.

The second question is how Eusebius was able to say that the story was also present in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

It is generally assumed that this information was not given by Papias himself.¹⁵⁷ But from his *historia ecclesiastica* we may draw the conclusion that Eusebius did not know the contents of this Gospel.¹⁵⁸ But on the other hand, we should not assume that Eusebius deliberately gave false information. He might have happened to know of the origin of this particular passage from another source. Since the story obviously circulated among Jewish-Christians¹⁵⁹ it is also possible that Eusebius attributed it to some Jewish-Christian Gospel known to him by name only.

Didymus also appears to have been acquainted with some version of this story. It might be the case that one of the "Gospels" in which it was found according to him, was the Gospel according to the Hebrews from which he also quoted in other places (see XIII).¹⁶⁰

Thus, although we cannot reach a definite conclusion, there are reasons to assume that this story was present in some Jewish-Christian Gospel or other, maybe the Gospel of the Hebrews. It is, however, impossible to decide which Gospel version it was.

¹⁵⁶ For those who accept or reject this idea see Becker, *o.c.*, 92-93. Becker himself assumed that Papias has known the story as it is found in John, but after him we still find various opinions about this question, see Körtner, *o.c.*, 303, n. 39; Vielhauer, in: Hennecke-Schneemelcher I³, 78: "eine mögliche Hypothese"; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John I-XII, The Anchor Bible* (Garden City, New York 1966) 335: "...but we can not be certain that our story is the one meant...".

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Vielhauer, *o.c.*, 78; Becker, *o.c.*, 99, and Körtner, *o.c.*, 149.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Becker, *o.c.*, 100-101, and Körtner, *o.c.*, 149, see also p. 11.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Becker, *o.c.*, 150-160.

¹⁶⁰ Lührmann, *art. cit.*, 321, gives the following conclusion only: "Unabhängig von allen Spezialproblemen und gegen die Erstinterpretation, hoffentlich durch sie nicht verstellt, ist festzustellen, dass Didymus in EcclT IV 223, 6-13 eine Geschichte wiedergibt, die weder eine in Handschriften des Johannesevangelium überlieferte Fassung von Joh. 8: 3-11 noch eine blosse Anspielung darauf ist, sondern eine ursprünglichere Form der Perikope von der Ehebrecherin, ein neuer Text apokrypher Jesusüberlieferung, der älter ist als die Fassung, die später in das Johannesevangelium aufgenommen worden ist".

XXXVIII

Jerome, *Epistula 20.5*

ed. I. Hilberg, *Epistulae I*, CSEL 54,110

383

Denique Mattheus qui euangelium hebraeo sermone conscripsit ita posuit "osianna barrama" id est "osanna (var. L. ossanna) in excelsis"...

Finally Matthew, who wrote the Gospel in the Hebrew language, put it in the following way "osianna barrama" which means "osanna in excelsis"...

Parallel Text

Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matthaeo Libri XII*

ed. Beda Paulus, CCSL LVIB (Turnholti 1984) 1020
middle 9th cent.

Secundum quod Mattheus qui hoc Euangelium Hebreo sermone scripsit hoc verbum in fine proposuit osanna rama quod est secundo dicere: salus in excelsis.

For this reason Matthew, who wrote this Gospel in Hebrew wrote this word at the end *osanna rama*, which means to say a second time "salvation in the highest"

Commentary

It seems as if the reference is only meant to give the original Hebrew or Aramaic of the words *osanna in excelsis* in Matth. 21,9 and Mark 11,9-10, cf. Greek: ὠσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις. This might be true for *osianna*, but whatever the meaning of *barrama* may be, it is in the singular, unlike *in excelsis*. We have to conclude that the translation is not literal but offers a different version of these words.

In Matth. 21,9 we read ὠσαννὰ τῷ νῷ Δαυίδ...ὠσαννὰ. It is evident that Jerome is speaking of the second part of this verse only. The only variant reading of any relevance to our theme occurs in sy^(s) and reads καταβατεῖσαν. In Mark 11,9-10 we read ὠσαννὰ...ὠσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις. Here the following variant readings are noteworthy: Θ f.13 565 700 and a few other manuscripts add τῷ ὑψίστῳ after the first ὠσαννὰ, cf. *eminentissimo* in k, *in excelsis* in c and *in excelso* in a. Next we read καταβατεῖσαν in sy^s and εἰρήνη ἐν οὐρανῷ in Θ 28 700. In the Old Latin text we find *osanna, ossanna*

and *ossana* and in the second part of this *vers in excelsis* and *in altissimis*. The word *osanna* agrees with the text of the Vulgate.

The word *osanna* and the Latin variant readings represent a transcription of the Hebrew אָשָׁר שָׁרֵךְ which can be found in Ps. 118,25. The word *osianna* to which Jerome refers is, therefore, in agreement with the Hebrew expression.

The word *barrama* is a transcription of the Hebrew בָּרָם preceded by בְּ. The word can be translated "high" or "higher place", but it does not usually express the idea "heaven" for which בָּרָם is used, cf. Ps. 148,1 and Sir. 43,1 and 8. This is also evident from the Apocryphal Acts of Pilate I 4,¹⁶¹ where the parallel passage reads ὁσαμά μεμβρομή βαρουχαμά ἀδομά. Here the word μεμβρομή is obviously meant to be a transcription of בָּרָם. Nevertheless, we see no reason to doubt that the word בָּרָם can be used in the same sense.

We can thus conclude that Jerome gives a Hebrew translation of the words in Matth. 21,9, but proceeds from a text with the words ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις in the singular. This is interesting because the singular form is not entirely unknown in the textual tradition of the canonical Gospels.

We may assume that Jerome himself is not responsible for this translation, because there is no reason to suppose that he was acquainted with the singular form. Yet he must have come across this reading somewhere.

His source could have been a Jewish-Christian Gospel written in Hebrew but this is not plausible. In the first place because we do not know of any Jewish-Christian Gospel in that language and in the second place because Jerome does not speak of a Gospel in the introduction to this passage. We must, therefore, suppose that some translation of these words was in circulation. The existence of such a translation is supported by the Acts of Pilate. Jerome himself assumed that this translation was taken from the original Hebrew text of Matthew.¹⁶²

XXXIX

Jerome, *de viris illustribus* XVI

ed. C.A. Bernouilli, *Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengesch. Quellenschr.* II (Freiburg i.B u. Leipzig 1895, Frankfurt 1968) 17-18

392

Ignatius...scripsit...ad Smyrnaeos et proprie ad Polycarpum...in qua et de evangelio, quod nuper a me translatum est, super persona Christi ponit testimonium dicens: Ego uero et posci resurrectionem in carne eum vidi et credo, qui sit; et quando uenit

¹⁶¹ See ed. C. de Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Lipsiae 1876) 219.

¹⁶² See also E. Lohse, *Nov. Test.* 6 (1963) 113-119.

ad Petrum et ad eos qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis: Ecce palpate me et videte, quia non sum daemonium incorpore. Et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt.

Ignatius...wrote...to the Smyrnaeans and separately to Polycarp...in which he bore witness also to the Gospel which I have recently translated, in respect of the person of Christ stating: I indeed saw him in the flesh after the resurrection and I believe that it was he and when he came to Peter and those who were with Peter, he said to them : Behold, touch me and see how I am not a demon without a body, and straightway they touched him and believed.

Parallel Text

Jerome, *in Esaiam* prol. 65

ed. M. Adriaen, *Commentariorum in Esaiam XII-XVII, CCSL LXXIIIA* (Turnholti 1963) 714
408/10

Cum enim apostoli eum putarent spiritum, vel iuxta evangelium quo Hebraeorum lectitant Nazarei, incorpore daemonium, dixit eis : ... (after which follows Luke 24,38-39)...

For since the apostles supposed him to be a spirit or according to the Gospel which is of the Hebrews and is read by the Nazoreans, a demon without a body, he said to them...

Here we may add Origen, *de Principiis* I, prooem. 8

ed. P. Koetschau, *GCS, Origenes V* (Leipzig 1913) 14,18-15,5
after 225/30

Si vero qui velit nobis proferre ex illo libello, qui Petri Doctrina appellatur, ubi salvator videtur ad discipulos dicere: Non sum daemonium incorporeum, primo respondendum est ei quoniam liber ipse inter libros ecclesiasticos non habetur, et ostendendum quia neque Petrus est ipsa scriptura neque alterius cuiusquam, qui spiritu dei fuerit inspiratus.

If then somebody should like to produce for us from that book which is called the Doctrine of Peter, where the Saviour seems to say to his disciples: I am not a demon without a body, it has first to be answered him that this book is not reckoned among the ecclesiastical books and it must be pointed at that neither is this writing of Peter nor anybody else who is inspired by the Spirit of God.

Commentary

Jerome writes that a particular passage in Ignatius, *ad Polycarpum*, can be found in a Jewish-Christian Gospel. According to the passage Jesus said that he was not a demon without a body.

The passage to which Jerome refers is, however, not to be found in this letter but in his *ad Smyrnaeos* and reads: 'Ἐγώ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὅντα καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἥλθεν ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἰδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον (III 1-2).

It is an established fact that Jerome does not immediately quote from Ignatius but from Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* III 36 11, who refers to this passage.¹⁶³

This, however, does not mean to say that the passage was not part of a Jewish-Christian Gospel. But matters become complicated as soon as we realise that the same remark can also be found according to Origen in the *Doctrina Petri*.¹⁶⁴

It is possible that Jerome quoted the passage from Eusebius and that he remembered the reference in Origen. If so, he made a small mistake with regard to the source of this passage.

The words *daemonium incorpore* are anti-docetic. We might well expect a Jewish-Christian Gospel to be anti-docetic, but, on the other hand, the phrase itself is difficult to express in a Semitic language.¹⁶⁵

XL

Jerome, *in Matthaeum* 2,5

ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, *Commentariorum in Matthaeum Libri IV*, CCSL LXXVII (Turnholti 1969) 13

398

¹⁶³ Ignatius used the word οἶδα by which he expressed his own conviction. The word was read by Eusebius but he wrote εἶδον which made the speaker an eyewitness. This secondary text was quoted by Jerome. Those who assume that Eusebius is Jerome's source are Lagrange, L'Évangile selon les Hébreux 324-327; Bardy, *art. cit.* 13; Schmidtke, Neue Fragmente 62 and 257, and Waitz, *art. cit.*, 64-65.

¹⁶⁴ More than one possibility exists to explain the relation between the two passages, for example, Resch, *Agrapha* 246-247: both in the Gospel acc. to the Hebrews and the *Doctrina Petri*; Schmidtke, Neue Fragmente 301-302: Ignatius depends on the *Doctrina Petri* and the Gospel of the Nazoraeans on the same text or Ignatius; Zahn, *o.c.*, 701-702: Gospel acc. to the Hebrews, Ignatius and the *Doctrina Petri* are independent; Lagrange, L'Évangile selon les Hébreux 324-327: both in the Gospel acc. to the Hebrews and the *Doctrina Petri*; Bardy, *art. cit.* 3: similar passages in the Gospel acc. to the Hebrews and the *Doctrina Petri*.

¹⁶⁵ See Vielhauer, in: Hennecke I³, 82-83. This has already been noticed by Waitz, in: Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen/Leipzig 1924²) 10-11, who, therefore, supposed that a Greek version of the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans must have been known at some time, see also, Neue Untersuchungen über die sogenannten judenchristlichen Evangelien, ZNW 36 (1937) 60-81, esp. 64-65.

At illi dixerunt ei: In Bethleem Iudeae. Librarium error est; putamus enim ab evangelista primum editum sicut in ipso Hebraico legimus: Iudeae, non Iudeae. Quae est enim aliarum gentium Bethleem ut ad distinctionem eius hic Iudeae poneretur? Iudeae autem idcirco scribitur quia est et alia Bethleem in Galilea. Lege librum Iesu filii Nave. Denique et in ipso testimonio quod de Micheae prophetia sumptum est ita habetur. Et tu Bethleem terra Iuda.

And they said to him: In Bethlehem of Judah. Here there is an error on the part of the copyists; for we believe that the evangelist in his first edition wrote, as we read in the original Hebrew: Judah and not Judea. For which Bethlehem of the other tribes would he put down to distinguish it from that in Judea? "Of Judah" is, therefore, written because there is also another Bethlehem in Galilee. Read the Book of Joshua, the son of Nun. Finally we also have it according to the testimony which is taken from the prophet Micah having it as follows: And you Bethlehem land of Judah.

Parallel Text

1. Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matthaeo Libri XII*

ed. Beda Paulus, *CCSL Cont. Med. LVI* (Turnholti 1984) 158
middle 9th cent.

Nam in Hebraeo sic habet: Et tu Bethleem Efrata parvus es in milibus Iuda

For in Hebrew it is said as follows: And you Bethlehem Efrata, you are small among the rulers of Juda

2. Sedulius Scottus, *Super Evangelium Matthei 1,1,11,1*

ed. B. Löfstedt, *Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus, Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 14* (Freiburg 1984) 67
middle 9th cent.

Librarium error est. Putamus enim ab evangelista primum editum, sicut in ipso Ebraico legimus 'Iudeae', non 'Iudeae'

This is an error on the part of the copyists, for we believe that in the first edition 'Iudah' not 'Judea' was put, as we read in the original Hebrew

Commentary

Jerome explains why Matth. 2,5 is speaks of *in Bethleem Iudeae*. This has been done because there is according to Josh. 19,15 also a Bethlehem in Galilee. To this he adds that the name *Iudeae* is an error of the copyists and that the original author of Matthew wrote *Iudea* "as in the original Hebrew". This again agrees with the quotation of Micah which follows in Matth. 2,5 and which reads: *Et in Bethleem terra Iuda*.

In the New Testament the Greek word 'Ιουδαία is normally used to render the name of the region, cf. Matth. 2,22; 3,1.5; 4,25; 19,1; 14,16; Mark 1,5 and other passages. The word 'Ιούδας, genitive 'Ιούδα, see Blass-Bebrunner, *Gramm. des Neut. Griechisch* § 85,1, is used in Matth. 1,2.3; 2,6 (2 x); Luke 1,39; 3,33; Hebr. 7,14; 8,8 and Rev. 5,5 and 7,5, but of these only 2,6 (twice in the quotation already mentioned earlier) and Luke 1,39 speak of the region.

This means that the word 'Ιουδαία and its Latin equivalent are generally used in passages dealing with the region. However, in Matth. 2,5 and 6 it appears that mutual influence can be seen between 'Ιουδαίας in 5 and 'Ιούδα in the quotation. This influence can also be found with the word 'Ιουδαίας which is used a few verses earlier in Matth. 2,1. This can be shown by the following list: 2,1 'Ιούδα in 372; *Iuda* in aur vgcodd; *Iudea* in fsec.hnd ff² vgcodd; 2,5 'Ιούδα in 372; *Iuda* in aur; *Iudea* in fsec.hnd ff¹ g vgcodd; 2,6 'Ιουδαίας in D; *Iudeae* in a c d ff¹ g¹ q; *Iudeae* in b syscp and for the second time *Iudeae* in k.

This means that the reading *Iuda* or *Iudea* in Math.. 2,1 and 5 was found in many Latin manuscripts, obviously because of the influence of the word *Iuda* in the quotation which follows this verse. We must assume that Jerome was aware of these variant readings.

It remains possible that the word *Iuda* was used in a Hebrew-Christian Gospel which was written in Aramaic but it is also possible that Jerome drew his own conclusions about *in ipso Hebraico* on the basis of the variant readings and of the quotation in Micah.

XLI

Sedulius Scottus, *Super Evangelium Mathei 1,1-11,1*

ed. B. Löfstedt, Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus, *Aus der lateinischen Bibel* 14 (Freiburg 1989) 66-67. B = Cod. Berol. Phill. 1660, 9th cent. and V = Cod. Vindob. 740, 9th cent. middle 9th cent.

Ita nanque refert evangelium, quod secundum Ebreos (del. B²) praetitulatur: Intuitus Ioseph oculis vidit turbam viatorum comitantium, venientium ad speluncam et dixit: Surgam et procedam foras in obviam eis. Cum autem processisset dixit ad Simonem Ioseph: Sic mihi videntur isti qui veniunt, augures esse. Ecce enim omni momento respiciunt in caelum et inter se disputant, sed et peregrini videntur esse, quoniam et habitus eorum differt ab (ad V) habitu nostro.

Nam vestis eorum amplissima est, et color fuscus est eorum densius, et pileos (B², pilla BV) habent in capitibus suis et molles mihi videntur vestes eorum, et in pedibus eorum sunt sarabellae (saraballa B). Et ecce steterunt et intendant in me, et ecce iterum coeperunt hoc venientes ambulare. Quibus verbis liquide ostenditur non tres tantum viros, sed turbam viatorum venisse ad Dominum, quamvis iuxta quosdam eiusdem turbae praecipui magistri certis nominibus Melchus, Caspar, Phadizarda nuncupentur.

In this way, then, the Gospel which is entitled according to the Hebrews, informs (us): Joseph looked with his eyes and saw a multitude of travellers who came together to the cave and he said: Let me stand up and go forward outside to meet them. When he went forward, Joseph said to Simon: Thus, it seems to me that those who come are soothsayers. Look, for every moment they look at the sky and discuss with each other. But they also seem to be foreigners because their clothes are different from ours. For their mantles are very wide and the color of them is very dark and they have pointed head-dresses on their head and their mantles seem to me soft and they have Persian shoes on their feet. And see, they stand still and look at me and see they begin to walk again and they come here. From these words it is clearly shown that not three men but a multitude of travellers came to the Lord although I assume that according to some of them the leaders of that multitude were named Melchus, Caspar (and) Phadizarda

Parallel Text

Gospel-Book written at Armagh by Maelbrigte

B. L. Harley 1802, fol. 11r, in margin
1138

Legitur in euangelio secundum ebreos quod uenit ioseph foras ex diuersorio ante quam intrarent domum et admirans eos dixit semeon filium suum quod perigrini (word added to the text in the MS.) essent cognoscens ab habitu

It is read in the Gospel according to the Hebrews that Joseph came outside from the inn before they entered the house and he said, while he admired them, to his son Simeon: They are foreigners which can be seen from their apparel

We may add that similar stories can be found in *The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* according to the manuscript 0.3.9 in the Library of the Dean and Chapter of Hereford and B. L. Arundel 404, ch. 89, the text of which was edited by M.R. James, *Latin Infancy Gospels* (Cambridge 1927) 82 and 83. A parallel text can be found in the Irish Book *Leabhar Breac*, 137, col. 1, line 27, see M. McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin 1975) 43-44. In none of these three sources is anything said about the presence of this story in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Commentary

Sedulius gives an interesting reference to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The passage is, however, also known from other sources which might be helpful in answering the question whether this reference was really ever part of a Jewish-Christian Gospel.

The Gospel of Maelbrigte agrees with Sedulius with regard to the origin of this story. The reference, however, contains no more than a mere summary of the contents. It is characteristic that it also refers to a discussion between Joseph and his son Symeon. Nothing can be said about the relation between the two passages. The Gospel of Maelbrigte might depend on Sedulius but the relation is possibly more complex. This is clear from two other passages of the same story.

In 1927 James published the texts of two manuscripts with Nativity Stories which both contain the story about Joseph and Symeon which obviously belong to the same tradition. The version in the Arundel Manuscript is longer than that in the Hereford Manuscript but both stories are longer again than the one in the Gospel of Maelbrigte.

The Nativity Stories according to the manuscripts published by James represent a compilation of various sources of which the *Protevangelium Jacobi* and the *Liber de infantia* or Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew are the most important.¹⁶⁶ But apart from these James noticed another source of unknown origin. It is striking that according to this source both Joseph and his son Symeon play an important part in the events before during and after the birth of Christ.¹⁶⁷ Symeon apart from Joseph is the second witness to a number of miraculous events surrounding the birth of Jesus. James arrived at the conclusion that the stories reveal a docetic nature.¹⁶⁸ He rejects the idea that they were taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews but suggests that they were present in the Gospel according to Peter.¹⁶⁹

It is important that James concluded that the present story belongs to a group of other stories that were present in some unknown source. It is, however, difficult to prove that this source must have been the Gospel according to Peter because this Gospel is held to have had a docetic character. A Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition might be possible but we know that Sedulius is not thought to have direct knowledge of any of these Gospels.

We would now like to make a few remarks about the text itself. Sedulius quoted this passage in order to demonstrate that the number of those who came

¹⁶⁶ M.R. James, *Latin Infancy Gospels* (Cambridge 1927) IX-X.

¹⁶⁷ See for Symeon J. Blinzler, *Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu*, *Stuttgarter Bibelstudien* 21 (Stuttgart 1967) 96-100, esp. 100: "Die Hinrichtung durch Attikus (scil. of Symeon, cf. Eusebius, *hist. eccles.* III 32 6) ist höchstwahrscheinlich im Jahre 107 n. Chr. erfolgt. Da Simon zu diesem Zeitpunkt ein Alter von 120 Jahren erreicht hätte, fällt seine Geburt in die Zeit um 14 v. Chr.".

¹⁶⁸ James, *o.c.*, XVII-XXVII.

¹⁶⁹ James, *o.c.*, XXVIII-XXX.

to adore Jesus was not limited to three persons. This view would seem to agree with the reference quoted. But, nevertheless, he follows the contemporary tradition and writes that the most important visitors were Melchus, Caspar and Phardizarda.¹⁷⁰

The ensuing discussion between Joseph and his son Symeon is very interesting because it is characteristic of the source from which the story was taken. They see a number of *augures*¹⁷¹ who are supposed to be astrologers because they look continuously to the heavens.

The clothes of the visitors had already been described,¹⁷² but here their Persian origin is underlined in the statement that they have *pilea* on their heads¹⁷³ and their shoes are called *saraballae*.¹⁷⁴

The event took place in front of the cave in which Jesus was born. This idea is already present in the *Protevangelium Jacobi*.¹⁷⁵

We may conclude that the text gives the impression that Sedulius is referring to an ancient tradition of this story. In his time, for example, the idea of "the three kings" had already been firmly established.¹⁷⁶ The presence of the "cave" in this story might indicate that it was of Jewish-Christian origin but this was, on the other hand, widely known among Christian authors.¹⁷⁷

The presence of the story in Pseudo-Matthew might explain why it was supposed to be part of a Gospel according to the Hebrews.¹⁷⁸ An origin within a

¹⁷⁰ See H. Kehrer, *Die heiligen Drei Könige in Literatur und Kunst* I (Leipzig 1908, Nachdruck I u. II, Hildesheim/New York 1976) 64-75, see also Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu* 74-82, and U. Monneret de Villard, *Le Legende orientali sui Magi Evangelici, Studi e Testi* 163 (Città del Vaticano 1952).

¹⁷¹ In the *Vulgata* the word *magi* has been used which is generally found in Christian authors.

¹⁷² See Beda Venerabilis, *Collectanea et Flores* III (Basileae 1563) 649: *Melchior, senex et canus, barba prolixa et capillis, tunica hyacinthina, sago mileno et calceamentis hyacinthino et albo mixto opere pro mirario variae compositionis indutus; ... Caspar, juvenis imberbis, rubicundus, milenica tunica sago rubeo, calceamentis hyacinthini vestitus... Balthasar nomine: habens tunicam rubream, albo vario, calciamentis milenicis amicus*, see Kehrer, o.c., 66, n.9.

¹⁷³ The word *pilleus* or *pileum* or the Greek *πύλος* is a Phrygian pointed cap supposed to have been worn by Persians and already seen in the earliest pictures of this event, see S. Maria Maggiore in Rome (432-440) and a sarcophagus in Arles, Musée d'art Chrétien at the end of the 4th century, see *Die heiligen Drei Könige-Darstellung und Verehrung* Katalog zur Ausstellung des Wallraf-Richartz-Museum... 1982/83 (Köln 1982) 30-31.

¹⁷⁴ In Dan. 3,21 (Theod.) the words *ἐν τοῖς στραφόποις* have been used, cf. 3,94 (LXX and Theod.): *τὰ στραφόποι*, derived from the Persian *shalvār* or *shlūvār*.

¹⁷⁵ See XVIII 1 and also Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* LXXVIII 5, ed. Goodspeed 189.

¹⁷⁶ H. Hoffmann, *Die Heiligen Drei Könige* (Bonn 1975) 74: "Ähnlich ist die zunächst unbestimmte Anzahl der königlichen Magier seit Leo dem Grossen (440-461) - wohl den drei königlichen Gaben des Evangelienberichtes folgend - literarisch auf die heilige Dreizahl festgelegt", but in a note 7, he adds: "in der bildenden Kunst gibt es die Dreizahl bereits seit der ersten Hälfte des 2. Jahrhunderts".

¹⁷⁷ This received credibility due to the presence of a cave near Bethlehem which was supposed to be the place of Jesus' birth, see Origen, *c. Cels.* I 51, ed. P. Koetschau, GCS, Origenes I, 102, cf. Kehrer, o.c., 21, and H. Chadwick, *Origen, Contra Celsum* (Cambridge etc. 1953) 47, n. 5.

¹⁷⁸ Pseudo-Matthew was supposed to have been written by Matthew in Hebrew and to have been translated into Latin by Jerome. This is exactly the same tradition as that connected to the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel according to the Nazoreans.

Jewish-Christian community cannot, however, be totally excluded.

XLII

Haimo Halberstensis, *Comment. in Isaiam 53,13*

ed. Migne, *PL* 116, 994B
middle 9th cent.

Sicut in Evangelio Nazaraeorum habetur, ad hanc vocem Domini multa milia Iudeorum astantium circa crucem crediderunt

As it is said in the Gospel of the Nazoreans: at that voice of the Lord many thousands of the Jews who were standing around the cross believed.

Parallel Texts

1. Hugo of St. Cher, *in Librum Isaiae*

tom. IV (Venetiis 1732) 126b
middle 13th cent.

Et pro transgressoribus rogavit. Luc 24 e. Pater, ignosce illis, quia etc. Ad hanc vocem secundum Evangelium Nazaraeorum multa milia Iudeorum astantium circa crucem crediderunt.

And he prayed for the transgressors (Luke 24): Father, forgive them, because etc. At that voice many thousands of the Jews who were standing around the cross, believed, according to the Gospel of the Nazoreans.

2. *Historia Passionis Domini*

fol. 55r
14th cent.

Pater ignosce eis. Non enim sciunt quid faciunt. Et nota quod in ewangelio Nazaraeorum legitur quod ad virtuosam istam Christi oracionem VIII milia conversi sunt postea ad fidem. Scilicet tria milia in die pentecostes, sicut habetur Actum 2º et postea quinque milia de quibus dicitur Actum X.

Father forgive them, because they do not know what they do. And take heed of what is said in the Gospel of the Nazoreans that at this important prayer of Christ eight thousand were converted to the faith at a later date. This means

three thousand on the day of Pentecost, as it is said in Acts 2, and later five thousand of whom is spoken in Acts 10

Commentary

Hugo of St. Cher seems to depend on Haimo. The text differs slightly but the information and the words which have been used are exactly the same. *Historia Passionis Domini* on the other hand deviates considerably and gives some details of the number of Jews converted which are absent from Haimo. However, it is striking that both witnesses write that the passage was taken from the Gospel according to the Nazoreans, especially as both references depend on Jerome. This means that in the time between Jerome and Haimo a source must have existed which already suggested that the information was of Jewish-Christian origin.

Jerome speaks of the conversion of the Jews in *epist. 120* 8-9. The text reads as follows: *In tantum amavit Hierusalem dominus ut fleret eam et plangeret et pendens in cruce loqueretur: Pater, ignosce eis, quod enim faciunt, nesciunt, itaque impetravit, quod petierat, multaque statim de Iudeis milia crediderunt et usque ad quadragesimum annum datum est tempus paenitentiae.*¹⁷⁹ A second passage which is important is that in his *Comment. in Esaiam* and reads: *...deinde tria milia, et quinque milia Iudeorum in Dominum crediderunt.*¹⁸⁰

Both passages speak of the conversion of many Jews but their contexts are different. *Epist. 120* speaks of Jesus weeping over Jerusalem which can also be found in Luke 19,41: *Et adpropinquaverit videns civitatem flevit super illam.* The words spoken when Jesus hangs on the cross are those of Luke 23,34: *Pater, demitte illis; non enim sciunt quid faciunt.* The many thousands spoken of in the passage are also found in Acts 21,20: *Vides, frater, quot milia sunt in Iudeis qui crederunt,* and the fortytwo months which will be given to the Jews to repent have been taken from Rev. 11,3: *Et dabo duobus testibus meis et prophetabunt diebus mille ducentis sexaginta.*

The passage in *epist. 120* can only be understood if one takes the word *statim* not in the sense of "immediately" or "at once" but as "consequently" or "from that moment", because the second part of this passage speaks of events which took place a long time after Jesus' crucifixion.

The three thousand and the five thousand Jews mentioned in the commentary on Isaiah can be found in Acts 2,41 and 4,4.

Now we turn to the passages which were supposedly taken from the Gospel according to the Nazoreans. Haimo speaks of Luke 23,24 which is also referred to in Jerome, *epist. 120*: *Pater, ignosce eis...* The "many thousands" come from the same source. The only difference is that the present passage states that the Jews are standing around the cross. This can be easily explained if we

¹⁷⁹ Hieronymus, *Epistula CXX 2*, ed. I. Hilberg, *Epistulae II*, CSEL 45 492.

¹⁸⁰ Hieronymus, *Comment. in Es. XI 11-14*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL LXXIII, 154.

assume that the word *statim* has been taken in the sense of "immediately". In this way the remark in Jerome is something new and since it is not present in any of the canonical Gospels it has been ascribed to a Jewish-Christian Gospel which was supposedly known to have been frequently used by Jerome in order to give additional historical information.

The reference in *Historia Passionis Domini* also starts from Luke 23,24. Here it is said that at a later date eight thousand Jews became Christians. This agrees with the meaning of *epist.* 120 but the exact numbers have been obviously taken from Jerome's Commentary on Isaiah which refers to the three thousand of Acts 2,41 and the five thousand of Acts 4,4. The reference to Acts 10 is an error.

In its present form the passage in the *Historia Passionis Domini* does not give any information beyond that which is found in the New Testament. It combines passages which have been taken from Luke and Acts. It also follows the text of Jerome and avoids saying that the conversion took place at the time of Jesus' crucifixion. Nevertheless, it still speaks of information held to have been taken from an apocryphal source. We assume that the passage in this text is a correction with help of New Testament sources of a story like that found in Haimo and Hugo of St. Cher.

XLIII

Cod. Vat. Reg. Lat. 49

ed. A. Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia. Extraits des Manuscrits Latins de la Reine Christine conservés au Vatican, Studi e Testi* 59 (Città del Vaticana 1933) 58
9th cent.

Ita isti VIII dies pascae in quo resur(rexit) Christus filius dei significant VIII dies postremi pascae in quo iudicabitur totum semen Adae, ut nuntiatur in euangelio Ebreorum, et ideo putant sapientes diem iudicii in tempore pascae, eo quod in illo die resur(rexit) Christus ut in illo iterum resurgent sancti. Item in die pascae incipit deus creare creaturas in principio mundi, atque has formauit per VI dies ebdo(madis) usque dum requieuit in septimo die. Item similiter putatur mundus dispergi per VII dies iudicii, et vocari iustos in VIII^o die, ut sint a dextria dei patris. Item erunt signa magna per VII dies qui numerantur ante diem iudicii: Haec sunt signa primo diei, idest tonitrua magna <et> reliqua.

Thus these eight days of Easter on which Christ the Son of God rose from the dead signify the eight days of the last Easter on which day the whole seed of Adam will be judged, as is told in the Gospel of the Hebrews and thus the wise men think that the day of judgement is at the time of Easter at which day Christ rose from the dead just as on that same day the holy ones again will rise. In the

same way on the day of Easter God began to create creation at the beginning of the world and he gave it shape for six days of the week until he rested on the seventh day. Thus in the same way one believes that the world will fall apart during the seven days of judgement and the righteous ones will be called on the eighth day that they may be at the right side of God the Father. Thus also there will be great signs for the seven days which are counted down before the day of judgement: These are the signs of the first days, viz. the great thunderclaps etc.

Commentary

In the edition of Wilmart we read ... *VIII dies post remissionem*... A. Strobel proposed the reading *postremi* which fits into the context as we shall see presently.¹⁸¹

The passage is trying to say that the eight days of Easter parallel with the eight days before "the last Easter" during which the descendants of Adam will be judged. This is held to be present in the Gospel of the Hebrews. The passage continues with the words that the idea is also found with the wise men that say that at Easter not only Christ but also the saints will rise. The author of this passage also writes that God started to create the world on Easter Sunday. The creation took six days and God rested on the seventh. Therefore, the world will be judged for seven days and the righteous will be called on the eighth day. There will be great signs for seven days before the day of judgement.

Two ideas have been mixed up. In the first place it is said that according to the Gospel according to the Hebrews and some wise men mankind will be judged upon the eighth day, viz. Easter Sunday. Next it is said that in the preceding seven days many signs will be seen. The Gospel according to the Hebrews is said to speak of a judgement on the eighth day only.

The idea that Christ returns on the eighth day is well known. We can refer to Lactantius, *Div. instit.* VII 19 3.¹⁸² The notion of a judgement on the eighth day is found in Ps. Ignatius, *Magnesians* 9,¹⁸³ which reads: καὶ μετὰ τὸ σαρβατίσαι ἔορταζέται πᾶς φιλόχριστος τὴν κυριακήν, τὴν ἀναστάσιμον, τὴν βασιλίδα τὴν ὑπατὸν πασῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἦν περιμένων ὁ προφήτης ἔλεγεν, εἰς τὸ τέλος ὑπὲρ τῆς ὄγδοης, and Victorinus of Pettau, *de fabr. mundi* 6:¹⁸⁴ *Et ideo David in Psalmo VI pro die octavo dominum rogat, ne in ira neque in furore suo arguat eum aut iudicet. Hic est enim reuera futuri illius iudicij dies octauus qui extra ordinem septimanæ dispositionis excessurus est...*

What is said about the judgement here is not new but it is still not clear why it was held to be present in the Gospel of the Hebrews. The solution may

¹⁸¹ A. Strobel, Die "Keltische Katechese" des Cod. Vat. Regin. lat. 49 über das Hebräerevangelium, *Zeitschr. für die Kirchengesch.* 4. F. 76 (1965) 148.

¹⁸² Migne, PL 7, 797A: *Haec est nox (scil. of Easter), quae a nobis propter adventum regis ac Dei nostri per vigilio celebratur.*

¹⁸³ J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers Part II II, Sect. 2* (London 1885) 757-758.

¹⁸⁴ I. Hausleiter, in *CSEL* 49,5.

be given by a passage in Jerome, in *Matth. 25,6*:¹⁸⁵ *Traditio Iudeorum est, Christum media nocte uenturum in similitudinem Aegypti temporis, quando paschae celebratum est... Vnde reor et traditionem apostolicam permanisse, ut die uigilarum paschae ante noctis dimidium populos dimittere non liceat expectantes aduentum Christi...*

It is proven that we are dealing with a Jewish concept but a later generation may have come to the conclusion that it was also a Jewish-Christian tradition.¹⁸⁶

Finally we have to examine the notion of a judgement lasting seven days. This is not said to have also been found in the Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition. On the other hand we see that the same concept is found in the Apocalypse of Thomas which containss the following parallel passage: ...erunt per VII dies signa magna... *Tunc erit prima die inicium horae terciae diei...tonitrua magna... Ista sunt signa primae diei.*¹⁸⁷ We have to add that the general order of events differs from that given in the passage in our Vatican manuscript. In the Apocalypse the resurrection is supposed to take place on the sixth day. On the seventh there is to be a war of angels in heaven and on the eighth day the angels will sit on the clouds and will be joyful.

XLIV

Historia investigatio evangelium secundum Lucam

Clm 6235, fol. 49v-65v, esp. fol. 56r, ad Luke 10,13, ed. Bischoff, *Geschichte...* 260
9th cent.

Bezaida, in qua sanavit paraliticum cata Iohannem. In his civitatibus multae virtutes facte sunt, quae evangelium secundum Hebreos quinquaginta ter virtutes in his facta enumerat.

Bezaida in which He healed a paralytic according to John. In these cities many powers have been done. The Gospel according to the Hebrews sums up the fifty-three powers that have been done there.

¹⁸⁵ ed. Hurst-Adriaen, 237.

¹⁸⁶ See A. Strobel, *Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem* in Lc 17,20f, *ZNW* 49 (1958) 157-196, and A. Strobel, *Die "Bösen Buben" der syrischen Ostervigil*, *Zeitschr. für die Kirchengesch.* 4. F. 69 (1958) 113-114.

¹⁸⁷ D.P. Bihlmeyer, *Un Texte non interpolé de l'Apocalypse de Thomas*, *Revue Bénédictine* 28 (1911) 270-282, esp. 272,1.11-17.

Commentary

The passage deals with Luke 10,13, cf. Matth. 11,20-21, in which it is suggested that many miracles were performed in the cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida. In this connection the author refers to John 5,2, which speaks of one particular miracle said to have been taken place here. In the text accepted nowadays the city is called Βηθζαθά, but the Vulgate uses the name *Bethsaida* in John. This means that on the basis of this Gospel the whole New Testament only mentions one miracle that was performed in this city.

This lack of information is supposedly compensated for by the Gospel according to the Hebrews which is said to list fifty-three miracles. We must assume that the word *enumerat* does not only mean that the number itself was given but that the nature of the miracles was specified.

Such a list is not known from other sources and it is hardly plausible that this Gospel would devote so much space giving a detailed description of the events. On the other hand, early Christian tradition shows a steadily growing number of miracles performed by Jesus.¹⁸⁸

XLV

Pseudo Cyril of Jerusalem, *Discourse of Mary Theotokos by Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem*

ed. E. A. Wallis Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (The British Museum, London 1915) 59-60 and 637
10th cent. (manuscript)

Пече пет ḥīmat же ყаси զ̄ պ կան
զ̄իրայօս. же ի տեր պէχէ օտապ է ը Շիլ պիզ
յա Արաւե. ա ուստա ի աւածօս մոտե սինօս
ի աւկալէ. զ̄ ի մասութ. ի յատմոտե է րօս
չե միշալ. ավտալա ա պէχէ է րօս. աւս է ն
ուստ է պիօսլօս. աւմոտե է րօս. չե մարտ.
ավշառե զ̄ տէկալարի մասի պէնօտ. Անուսաւ
աւսւու մասօչ. ավալա զ̄ ու տէնրտ. ավսու ի
զ̄ինուստոլօս. աւտ յածուպ մասօչ զ̄ մա ուս.
արյան է եօլ ի տէրօւսւու. տ ուս ուս. ա
մուռալ ի ար է րօչ. աւմեստօչ. չե ավշին ի
ուստիսութ. ա պէտումօս. Աւտ աւտատու է զրայ
է չազ աւտալու. աւպարագիատ մասօչ է պուրե-

¹⁸⁸ See Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu* 363-365, who refers, *inter alia* to Justin Martyr, *apol.* I 22 and 48, and *Dial. c. Tr.* 69,6; Origen, *c. Cels.* II 48 and VIII 46; Tertullian, *apol.* 21, and other passages.

εἰων· αὐταςει πατε τρε τεφοτε ἀπιον· Ή τερ
οσταλος δικαιη πυγε η πεφοτε α πειωτ φιτε έ
τηε γαστιν·

That (monk) said: It is written in the (Gospel) according to (the) Hebrews: When the Christ was about to come to the earth to men, the good Father called a great power in the heavens, which is called Michael. He entrusted Christ to him. She (scil. power) descended into the world (and) was called Mary. He was seven months in the womb. After this she gave birth to him (and) he increased in age. He chose apostles (and) they preached of him everywhere. He fulfilled the appointed time which was appointed for him. The Jews became envious of him (and) began to hate him because he changed the custom of their law. And they opposed him, took him (and) handed him over to the governor. He gave him to them to be crucified. After having raised him to the cross the Father lead him away to heaven to Himself.

Commentary

With regard to the translation the following can be said. The word οτων is usually “to wish” or “will”, Greek βούλεσθαι, but also “to be about”, cf. W. E. Crumm, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Heidelberg 1977) 281: “Im Begriff sein”. The Coptic for “advance in age” can also mean “in stature”. The word αἰων, Greek αὐξάνειν, makes both expressions possible. The word ηωη can be compared to the Greek ηλοῦν and ηωη to the Greek λαμβάνειν. Finally we should say that the word γαστιν has probably to be read as γαστη¹⁸⁹.

It is generally assumed that this work was not written by Cyril of Jerusalem. He wrote his lectures between 347 and 350, but in this work we find a reference to Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, itself written in 374.¹⁹⁰ According to Orlandi this work was originally written in Coptic and the earliest possible date is in the seventh century.¹⁹¹

It is, however, still possible that we are dealing with an authentic reference to the Gospel according to the Hebrews.¹⁹²

The present discourse was written in honour of Mary. Already at the very beginning it is said: “Let Ebiôn now be ashamed, and Harpocrates, these godless heretics who say in their madness that she was a force of God which

¹⁸⁹ I thank Professor Dr. J. Zandee who helped me with the translation of the Coptic text.

¹⁹⁰ See E.A. Wallis Budge, *Miscellaneous...*, 639.

¹⁹¹ T. Orlandi, Coptic Literature, *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring (Philadelphia 1986), 51-81, esp. 79-80. I thank Professor Dr. R. van den Broek who sent me his “Der Bericht des Koptischen Kyrillos von Jerusalem über das Hebräerevangelium” in which he demonstrated that the reference has nothing to do with the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

¹⁹² It has been accepted as authentic by H. Waitz, *Neue Untersuchungen über die sogenannten judeochristlichen Evangelien*, ZNW 36 (1937) 68-81, esp. 73, and Waitz, in: E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen 1924²) 54, but doubted by Vielhauer, Hennecke-Schneemelcher I³, 86.

took the form of a woman, and came upon the earth, and was called Mary, and this force gave birth to Emmanuel for us". This is followed by: "O Biôn and Harpocration, and I will question you".¹⁹³ After some time the author writes that an incident took place. A certain monk who lived "in the neighbourhood of Maiôma of Gaza" who was instructed by "Biôn and Harpocratus" deceived all the people in the surrounding area.¹⁹⁴ The author continues: "And Apa Cyril said to him, 'Who were your fathers ?' And the monk said Satôr and Ebiôn, who succeeded him".¹⁹⁵ Then the monk answers with the words in the passage quoted above. In the rest of the text the content of the passage is discussed and the monk says that he uses five Gospels, the four canonical ones and the Gospel according to the Hebrews.¹⁹⁶ Finally the monk anathematises the heresies of Ebion and Harpocratus.¹⁹⁷

The text is not quite clear. It speaks of Ebiôn or Biôn and Harpocratus and Harpokration¹⁹⁸ and once of Satôr¹⁹⁹ and Ebiôn who are thought to have been "fathers" of the heretic. This relation between Ebion or the Ebionites and Carpocrates is already found in Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* I 26 2, cf. Hippolytus, *refut.* VII 34 1. Of some importance is also Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 30 1 3, where it is said that Ebion "took from the Carpocratians their viciousness". Satornilus can be found in the company of Basilides, Ebion, Cerinthus and Merinthus in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 31 2 1.

The text shows that the author supposed that Carpocrates and Ebion had used the same Gospel according to the Hebrews. From this Gospel a summary was given according to which the "mighty power" called Michael came to earth and was called Mary. Christ was in her womb for seven months.²⁰⁰

It is clear that the author wanted to refute the idea that Mary was of heavenly origin. This is a well-known view which is often mentioned by early Christian authors and which was rejected by Epiphanius in particular. We may call this heresy docetic.²⁰¹

In the rest of the text we can see some parallels with the New Testament. We give them here without comment: he increased in stature, cf. Luke 2,52; he chose the apostles, cf. Luke 6,13/John 6,70/Acts 1,2, also in the Gospel according to the Ebionites (VI); they preached him in every place, cf. Matth. 28,19; the appointed time, cf. John 19,39; the Jews became envious, cf. Mark

¹⁹³ Wallis Budge, 628.

¹⁹⁴ Wallis Budge, 636.

¹⁹⁵ Wallis Budge, 637.

¹⁹⁶ Wallis Budge, 638.

¹⁹⁷ Wallis Budge, 639.

¹⁹⁸ See about Carpocrates A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums* (Leipzig 1884, reprint 1963) 397-408.

¹⁹⁹ See about Satornilus Hilgenfeld, *o.c.*, 190-195.

²⁰⁰ See P.W. van der Horst, *Seven Months' Children in Jewish and Christian Traditions, Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 54 (1978) 346-360, esp. 359.

²⁰¹ See Epiphanius, *Panarion* 78 23 and 24, and R. van den Broek, *art.cit.*, in which he gives many examples of heretical ideas about Mary.

15,10/Matth. 1,18; he changed the custom of their law, cf. Acts 6,14; they handed him over to the governor, cf. Matth. 27,2; he gave him to be crucified, cf. Matth. 27,26 and Gospel of Peter V 19.

It is remarkable that the author does not give some particular objectionable quotation but rather a summary of an entire Gospel whose content does not differ much from that of the canonical texts. We must assume that the author came across a Gospel which he did not know but which obviously described the birth of Jesus in a more or less docetic way. One might suggest that it was the Gospel of Peter. This Gospel speaks of the ascension of Jesus to heaven from the cross (V 19) which parallels the end of the present passage: "After having raised him to the cross the Father led him away to heaven Himself". But whatever this Gospel was, it certainly was not one of the Jewish-Christian Gospels.

XLVI

Petrus de Riga, *Aurora* fol. 166v (formerly 161v)

Fitzwilliam Museum, Franklin McLean 31 (margin)
sec. half 12th cent.

in libris euangeliorum quibus utuntur Nazareni legitur quod radii prodierunt ex oculis eius quibus territi fugantur

In the books of the Gospels which the Nazoreans use we read that beams of light came from his eyes on account of which they fled in terror

Commentary

The passage speaks about of cleansing of the temple in Jerusalem and explains why the spectators were not able to resist Jesus, cf. Matth. 21,12-17/Mark 11,15-17/ Luke 19,45-47.

It is known that this quotation depends on Jerome²⁰² who writes in his Commentary on Matthew in connection with Matth. 21,15-16: *Igneum enim quiddam atque sidereum radiabat ex oculis eius et diuinitatis maiestas lucebat in facie. Cumque manum non audeant inicere sacerdotes tamen opera columnantur et testimonium populi atque puerorum qui clamabant: Osanna filio David...*²⁰³ To this we can add *epist. 65,8: nisi enim habuisset et in vultu quiddam oculisque sidereum.*²⁰⁴

²⁰² See already M. R. James, Notes on Apocrypha, *JTS* 7 (1906) 562-568, esp. 566.

²⁰³ ed. Hurst-Adriaen, *CCSL* LXXXVII, 189.

²⁰⁴ ed. Hilberg, *Epistulae I*, *CSEL* I (1905) 625.

Aurora appears to depend on the passage in Jerome's Commentary. That the author has no knowledge of the Gospel is clear from the introduction *in libris euangeliorum*. This is a proof that later authors tried to ascribe some of the remarkable historical comments in Jerome to his supposed knowledge of a Jewish-Christian Gospel tradition.

XLVII

Hugo of St. Cher, *in Ev. sec. Matthaeum*

tom. VI (Venetiis 1972) 6a
middle 13th cent.

In Evangelio Nazaraeorum legitur, ut dicit Chrys. quod Joseph Mariam videre facie ad faciem non poterat, quoniam Spiritus Sanctus eam a conceptione penitus impleverat, ita quod non cognoscebat eam propter splendorem vultus ejus.

In the Gospel of the Nazoraeans it is said, as Chrysostom says, that Joseph was not able to see Mary face to face, because she was deeply filled with the Holy Spirit, so, that he did not recognize her because of the splendour of her face.

Commentary

Hugo of St. Cher refers to John Chrysostom. However, this author never speaks of the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans. One might expect a remark like the present one in Ps. Chrysostom, *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*, but nothing can be found there about Mary's face.²⁰⁵

Even in Ps. Matthew, *Liber de Infantia*, there is no trace of a story like this one.²⁰⁶ We must assume that it must have been present in some Infancy Gospel but we cannot say in which version.

XLVIII

Hugo of St. Cher, *in Ev. sec. Matthaeum*

tom. VI (Venetiis 1732) 87b

²⁰⁵ ed. Migne, PG 56, 611-946, and R. Étaix, Fragments inédits de l' "Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum", *Revue Bénédictine* 84 (1974) 271-300.

²⁰⁶ This work was supposed to have been written by Matthew in Hebrew, cf. c. XIII, ed. C. de Tischendorf. *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Lipsiae 1876) 77: *Ad ingressum vero Mariae coepit tota spelunca splendorem habere, et quasi sol ibi esset ita tota fulgorem lucis ostendere...*

middle 13th cent.

Dicitur in Evangelio Nazaraeorum, quod duo, qui fuerunt mortui ante circiter annos quadraginta, boni et sancti viri, venerant in templum post resurrectionem Domini, et non loquentes petentes Pergamenum...

It is said in the Gospel of the Nazoraeans that two good and holy men who had died about forty years earlier entered the temple after the resurrection of the Lord and without speaking they wanted to go to Pergamum.

Commentary

In *Descensus Christi ad Inferos*, the second part of the Gospel of Nicodemus which in some manuscripts bears the title "Gospel of the Nazoraeans"²⁰⁷ it is said in c. XII (XXVIII): *Et duos testes quos Iesus a mortuis resuscitavit vidimus, qui multa mirabilia quae fecit Iesus in mortuis annuntiaverunt nobis....*²⁰⁸

It is not said here that they went to Pergamum.

XLIX

Hugo of St. Cher, *in Ev. sec. Matthaeum*

tom. VI (Venetiis 1732) 88a

middle 13th cent.

Dicitur in Evangelio Nazaraeorum, quod Judaei istum Joseph in carcere posuerunt, alligantes eum ad columnam, eo quod ita honorifice sepelisset eum. Et quod prius post resurrectionem apparuit ei in carcere, quae Mariae Magdalene, et liberavit eum de carcere.

It is said in the Gospel of the Nazoraeans that the Jews put this Joseph into prison, they fastened Him to a pillar because he had buried Him in an honourable way and that He appeared to him after the resurrection in prison prior to Mary Magdalene and that He liberated him from prison.

Parallel Text

Hugo of St. Cher, *in Ev. sec. Joannem*

tom. VI (Venetiis 1932) 395a

²⁰⁷ ed. C. de Tischenfeldorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Lipsiae 1876) 333.

²⁰⁸ ed. de Tischendorf 410.

middle 13th cent.

Legitur autem in Evangelio Nazaraeorum, quod tunc fuit captus Joseph, et positus in carcerem; unde primo apparuit ei Dominus post resurrectionem in carcere, Nicodemus vero fugit in villam Gamalielis

But it is said in the Gospel of the Nazoraeans that Joseph was taken at that time and was put into prison. The Lord appeared to him there in the first place after the resurrection in prison, but Nicodemus fled to the village of Gamaliel

Commentary

This story has obviously been taken from the *Gesta Pilati*, the first part of the Gospel of Nicodemus which was held to be the Gospel of the Nazoraeans (see XLVIII), c. XIII1 : ...*Iudaei...Joseph incluserunt...in domo ubi non erat fenestra...*²⁰⁹ According to ch. XV 5 Jesus appeared to him in prison.

Here it is said that Joseph went to Galilee or as one manuscript writes in *Arimathiam in domum meam*. The name Gamaliel may have been mixed up with Galilee.²¹⁰

L

Hugo of St. Cher, *in Epist. D. Pauli (ad 1 Cor. 15)*

tom. VII (Venetiis 1732) 115a

middle 13th cent.

Similiter primo apparuit B. Mariae Magdalene inter mulieres secundum ordinem apparitionum in Evangelio, quod dico, quia legitur in Evangelio Nazaraeorum, quod primo apparuit B. Virgini.

In the same way he appeared to holy Mary Magdalene among the women according to the order of the appearances in the Gospel, which I say, because in the Gospel of the Nazoraeans it is said that he first appeared to the holy Virgin.

Commentary

The story is interesting. Bauer already mentioned the widespread idea that Jesus appeared to his mother instead of to Mary Magdalene (John 20,1.11-

²⁰⁹ ed. C. de Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha* (Lipsiae 1876) 367.

²¹⁰ ed. de Tischendorf 381-382.

18).²¹¹ The tradition is already found in the *Diatessaron* and in *Ephrem*. The various references can easily be found with R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*.²¹² After this extensive study is not necessary to repeat the evidence in detail. For the present reference it is interesting to know in which way the tradition has been connected in the *Gospel of the Nazoraeans*. It was not part of the Latin *Passion Narratives* and it seems to have been known in Syriac, Greek and Coptic texts only.

This is a case where the possibility of an origin within a Jewish-Christian tradition cannot be dismissed out-of-hand.

LI

The Seventeen Miracles at Christ's Birth

According to the Book of Uí Máine in the Royal Irish Academy fol. 116v, col. b. 1. 36ff, ed. K. Meyer, *Zeitschr. für Celt. Philologie* V (1905) 24-25
manuscript before 1372

Inn-aidchi geini Críst cain seacht n-inganta dég domain
is áibind indister dùlibh 'san [s]oiscéla nEabhróibh.

According to the Yellow Book of Lecan in Trinity College Dublin p. 170, col. a, 1.16ff, ed. V. Hull,
The Middle Irish Apocryphal Account of "The Seventeen Miracles at Christ's Birth", *Modern Philology* XLIII (1945) 25-39, esp. 32-33
end 14th cent.

An n-aidchi geni Crist chain
Secht n-inganta déc demain
Is aibind innister daib
Isin t-soiscel iar n-Ebraib

The night of the birth of Christ the Fair
There were seventeen miracles of the world.
Delightfully are they related to you
In the *Gospel to the Hebrews*

Commentary

Already in the oldest known *Nativity Story*, the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, we read that during the night of Jesus' birth a number of miracles were seen by Joseph. The pole of heaven stands still, the birds of the air are motionless, workmen at

²¹¹ Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu* 263.

²¹² (Cambridge 1975) 146-148 and 329-334.

their dinners neither chewed nor lifted their hands, and there were other miracles.²¹³ We may assume that these seventeen wonders represent a legendary expansion of this tradition.²¹⁴

LII

Historia Passionis Domini

fol.25v

14th cent.

...et extersit pedes eorum. Et sicut dicitur in evangelio Nazaraeorum singulorum pedes osculatus fuit. Petrus vero humiliatis obsequium...

...and he cleansed their feet. And as it is said in the Gospel of the Nazoraeans he kissed the feet of each of them. Peter, however, because of humility...

Commentary

The passage refers to John 13,5-6. It would already be remarkable enough that a story which is found only in John is also present in the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans which is closely related in Matthew.

The idea that Jesus kissed the feet of his disciples is nowhere to be found in the story as it is known to us. Two passages may be of some importance. Luke 7,28 speaks of a woman who washed the feet of Jesus; the text continues *et capillis capitum sui tergebat, et osculatur pedes eius...* The other passage is Mark 10,21 where the Old Latin manuscripts b and q read: *Iesus intuens (respiciens q) eum osculatus est.*

However, we assume that the present reference can better be explained from the liturgical ceremony of the washing of the feet which is known from the seventh century onward. This ceremony was usually closed with the kissing of the feet.²¹⁵

LIII

Historia Passionis Domini

²¹³ Ch. XVIII 32, see also Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu* 67.

²¹⁴ See for the difficulties in establishing a date for the composition of this account of the seventeen miracles V. Hull, *art.cit.* 25-38.

²¹⁵ See *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1039, s.v. *Pedilavium*, and especially D. Stiefenhofer, *Die liturgische Fusswaschung am Gründonnerstag in der abendländischen Kirche, Festgabe Alois Knöpfler* (Freiburg 1917) 325-339, esp. 327, 334-338.

fol. 32r
14th cent.

Sequitur Luc. 22. Apparuit autem ei angelus de celo confortans eum. Qualiter autem angelus Christum in agonia sua oracionis confortaberit dicitur in Evangelio Nazareorum et idem ponit Anselmus in planctu suo. Constans esto domine modo enim venit tempus quo per tuam passionem redimendum est genus humanum in Adam venditum. Sequitur Luc. 22. Et factus est sudor eius...

Here follows Luke 22. But an angel from heaven appeared to him and comforted him. How then the angel comforted Christ in the agony of his prayer is told in the Gospel of the Nazoraeans. And the same is laid down by Anselmus in his elegy. For the definite time had come for the Lord in which by his passion the generation of men which was sold in Adam had to be redeemed. Here follows Luke 22. And it happened that his sweat...

Commentary

The author of *Historia Passionis Domini* knows the text of Luke 22,44-45 as part of the canonical version of Luke which agrees with the Vulgate. He wants to say that in the Gospel of the Nazoraeans the words of the angel have been given. He seems to add that the same is found with Anselmus in his *Planctus*.²¹⁶

From this we may conclude that according to the present text Luke 22,44-45 was part of the Gospel according to the Nazoraeans. The authenticity of these verses has always been a matter of dispute which is reflected in the manuscripts of the New Testament.²¹⁷

The problem with these verses is clear. Initially they were important because they helped to refute the docetists,²¹⁸ but later they became objectionable because of their emphasis on the human side of Jesus.²¹⁹

It is possible that a passage like this was part of a Jewish-Christian Gospel. It is even possible to assume that it gave the content of the message of the

²¹⁶ The text might refer to *Quid dedit capite meo...*, see Migne, *PL* 187, 1133, and A. Wilmart, *Auteurs Spirituels et Textes Dévots du Moyen Age Latin* (Paris 1932) 517. n.1: "...le fameux *Planctus* dramatisé: *Quis dabit capite meo aquam ?...*, dévolu ici encore à Saint Augustin, mais prête ailleurs à Saint Anselme ou à Saint Bernard..."

²¹⁷ See *The New Testament in Greek. The Gospel according to St. Luke*. Part Two, Chapters 13-24. Edited by the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project (Oxford 1987) 190, from which it appears that the oldest witnesses like P⁶⁹ and P⁷⁵ omit these verses. f.13 add them after Matth. 26,39 !

²¹⁸ See Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.*103 8, ed. Goodspeed 220.

²¹⁹ See Epiphanius, *Panarion* 31 4-5, cf. A. Feuillet, *Le Récit Lucanien de l'“Agonie de Gethsémani”* (Lc XXII,39-46), *NTS* (1975/6) 397-417; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (X-XXIV), *The Anchor Bible* (Garden City, New York 1985) 1443, with literature, and also T. Baarda, *Luke 22,42-47 and the Emperor Julian as a Witness of the Text of Luke*, *Nov. Test.* 38 (1988) 229-296.

angel. However, a definite answer to the question of authenticity cannot be given.

LIV

Historia Passionis Domini

fol. 35r

Sequitur Io. 18... et vidit singula qui sibi illata fuerunt ludibria et penas. In evangelio Nazareorum ponitur causa unde Iohannes notus fuerit pontificii, quia cum fuerit pauperis piscatoris Zebedei, sepe portaverat pisces ad curias pontificium Anne et Cayphe. Exivit autem Iohannes ad ancillam hostiariam et ab ea impetravit quo Petrus socius suus qui ante ianuam stetit plorans fuit intromissus...

Here follows John 18... and he saw all the mockeries and penalties which were inflicted upon him. In the Gospel of the Nazoraeans the reason is given why John was known to the high priest. Because when he was the son of the poor fisherman Zebedee, he often brought fish to the palace of the high priests Annas and Caiaphas. John also went to the slave of the enemies and he asked her how Peter, his friend, who was standing in front of the door weeping, had come in...

Commentary

The passage deals with John 18,15. The interesting remark is not known from other sources. The idea that John was known to the priest is also found in the Heliand: "Schon lange war Johannes dem Hausherrn bekannt. Drum durfte er in den Hof hinein in der Menge mitgehen."²²⁰

LV

Historia Passionis Domini

fol.44r

...et nota quo Pylatus tantum passionem et contumeliam domino propter maliciam simpliciter non intulit... ideo ad satisfaciendum malicie iudeorum fecit eum tam contumeliose illudi et flagellari. ad columpnam ligatum sperans quod iudei hac afflictione Christi deberent contentari. Legitur in ewangelio Nazareorum quod

²²⁰ ed. F. Genzmer (Stuttgart 1966) 154.

Iudei appreciaverunt quattuor milites ad flagellandum dominus tam dure usque ad effusionem sanguinis de toto corpore. Eosdem eciam milites appreciaverunt quod ipsum crucifix(ere)unt sicut dicitur Io. 19. In omnibus istis intermixti Iudei cum gentibus. Et nota quod magister in historia scolastica...

...and take heed how Pilate not simply inflicted so much suffering and penalty to the Lord because of wickedness ... Therefore he made him be mocked and scourged to satisfy the wickedness of the Jews. He hoped that by binding him to a pillar the Jews would be content with the torment of Christ. We read in the Gospel of the Nazoreans that the Jews invited four soldiers to scourge the Lord to such an extent that blood streamed from his whole body. The same soldiers were invited also to crucify him as is said in John 19. In all this the Jews were mixed up with the gentiles. And take heed what the master in the *historia scholastica*...

Commentary

The passage refers to John 19,1-3 and 19,23. From the second passage it is possible to draw the conclusion that four soldiers were present at the moment of Jesus' crucifixion. This is also maintained by Augustine, in *Johannis evangelium CXVIII: Unde apparet quatuor fuisse milites qui eo crucifigendo praesidi paruerunt...*²²¹ The same idea is found in the Acts of Thomas, ch. 165, which speaks of "hidden mysteries" according to which Thomas was formed out of four elements and belonged to One who "corresponds to the four soldiers and one chief".²²²

LVI

Leabhar Breac

ed. R. Atkinson, *The Passions and the Homilies from Leabhar Breac, Todd Lectures Series* (Royal Academy, Dublin 1887)
before 1411

p. 165 Ructha imorro focetoir o'n t-shlaníccid na hech-si for cúa di-a tigernaib,
amal demnigter is-in soscela iar n-Ébraidib
p: 421 *Haec autem animalia a Saluatore retro ducta sunt dominis suis, ut in euangeliō secundum Ebraeos legitur*

²²¹ ed. Migne, *PL* 35, 1947.

²²² ed. Lipsius-Bonnet, *Acta Apost. Apocr.* II 2, 279.

But these animals have been brought back by the Saviour to their owners as it is read in the Gospel according to the Hebrews

Commentary

The remark may avoid the idea that Jesus stole the colt because it nowhere in Matth.21,1-9/Mark 11,1-10/Luke 19,28-40 is said that Jesus returned the animal to its owners. It appears, however, that the background to the whole event was firmly established in Jewish law in which it is said that the animal which somebody uses has to be given back.²²³ In this way the story becomes very interesting. However, it also appears to be a tradition known among Greek commentators.²²⁴

²²³ See J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament: The Palm Sunday Colt*, *Nov. Test.* 13 (1971) 241-258.

²²⁴ Des Petrus von Laodicea *Erklärung des Matthäusevangeliums*, ed. G. Heinrici, *Beitr. z. Gesch. und Erklärung des Neuen Testaments* V (Leipzig 1908) 231: μετὰ δὲ τὸ ποιῆσαι τὴν χρείαν ἀποστέλλει τὴν δύναν τῷ δεσπότῃ αὐτῆς κατὰ τὸν τῆς ιστορίας λόγον· ἀτοπον γὰρ ἀποστερηθῆναι τὸν δεσπότην τοῦ ιδίου.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Herausgegeben von W. Haase und H. Temporini (Berlin-New York)

Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirchl. Lit.*: O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (Freiburg im Br. I 1913², II 1914², III 1923², IV 1924¹⁻², V 1932)

Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu*: W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen 1909, Darmstadt 1967)

CCSL *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina* (Turnholti)

CSEL *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*

FRLANT *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen)

GCS *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig und Berlin)

Harnack, *Gesch. der altchristl. Lit.* A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius I/1 u. 2 II/1 u. 2* (Leipzig 1893-1904)

Hennecke-Schneemelcher I³ E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen 1959³)

Hieronymus, *Comm. in Matthaeum* Hieronymus, *Commentariorum in Matthaeum Libri IV*, ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, *CCSL LXXVII* (Turnholti 1969)

Klijn-Reinink A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects, Supplements to Novum Testamentum XXXVI* (Leiden 1973)

Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux* M.-J. Lagrange, *L'Évangile selon les Hébreux*, *Revue Biblique* 31 (1922) 161-181 and 321-349

Migne, PG Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* (Parisiis)

Migne, PL Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (Parisiis)

Nov. Test *Novum Testamentum* (Leiden)

NTS *New Testament Studies* (Cambridge)

Resch, Agrapha A. Resch, *Agrapha, Texte und Untersuchungen* V 4 (Leipzig 1889)

Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente* A. Schmidtke, *Neue Fragmente zu den jüdenchristlichen Evangelien, Texte und Untersuchungen* XXXVII 1 (Leipzig 1911)

Schneemelcher I⁵ W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I* (Tübingen 1987⁵)

Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* I-X/2 (Stuttgart 1933-1979)

TRE *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (Berlin)

Waitz, *Das Evangelium der Zwölf Apostel* H. Waitz, *Das Evangelium der Zwölf Apostel (Ebionitenevangelium)*, *ZNW* 13 (1912) 338-348 and 14 (1913) 38-64 and 117-132

Zahn, *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons* II/2 Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* II/2 (Erlangen/Leipzig 1892, Hildesheim/New York 1975)

ZNW *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, ed. R. A. Lipsius et M. Bonnet I II/1 and 2 (Lipsiae 1891, 1898, 1903, Darmstadt 1959)

Anselmus, *Quid dedit capite meo*, Migne, PL 187

Aphraates, *Demonstrationes*, ed. I. Parisot, *Patrologia Syriaca* I 1 and 2 (Parisiis 1894, 1907)

Apocalypse of Thomas, ed. P. Bihlmeyer, Un Texte non interpolé de l'Apocalypse de Thomas, *Revue Bénédictine* 28 (1911) 270-282

Apollinaris, ed. J. Reuss, Matthäuskomentare aus der griechischen Kirche, *Texte u. Unters.* 61 (Leipzig 1975)

The Apostolic Fathers, ed. B. Lightfoot (London 1885 and 1890)

Aristeas, *Letter of*, ed. A. Pelletier, *Sources Chrétiennes* 89 (Paris 1962)

Augustinus, *De Baptismo Libri septem*, ed. M. Petchenig, CSEL 51 (Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1908)

Augustinus, *The De Haeresibus of Saint Augustine, a Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*, ed. L.G. Müller, *The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies* XC (Washington 1956)

Augustinus, *Opus imperfectum contra Julianum*, Migne, PL 45

Augustinus, *in Iohannis evangelium*, Migne, PL 35

Beda Venerabilis, *Collectanea et Flores* III (Basileae 1563)

Beda Venerabilis, *Opera*, Pars II: *Opera Exegetica* 3, ed. D. Hurst, CCSL CXX (Turnholti 1960)

The Book of Thomas the Contender, ed. J. D. Turner, *SBL Dissertation Series* 23 (Missoula, Montana 1975).

Christiani Druthmari Corbiensis Monachi, *Expositio in Matthaeum Evangelistam*, Migne, PL 106

Chrysostomus, *In Isaiam*, Migne, PG 56

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, Buch I-VI, ed. O. Stählin, GCS, Clemens Alexandrinus II (Leipzig 1906)

Codex Novi Testamenti 4, 273, 566, 899 and 1424

Codex Vat. Reg. Lat. 49, ed. H. Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, Extraits des Manuscrits Latins de la Reine Christine conservés au Vatican, *Studi e Testi* 59 (Città del Vaticano 1933)

The Cologne Mani Codex P. Colon, inv.nr. 4780, ed. R. Cameron and A. J. Dewey, *SBL Text and Translations* 15 (Scholars Press 1979)

Constitutiones Apostolorum, ed. F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn 1905)

Cyril of Jerusalem, *in Isaiam*, Migne, PG 70

Diatessaron Leodiense, ed. D. Plooy a.o., *The Liège Diatessaron, Verhandel. der Kon. Akademie van Wetensch. te Amsterdam*, afd. Letterkunde, nwe Reeks Deel XXXI (Amsterdam I-VIII 1929-1970)

II Diatessaron in Volgare Italiano, ed. V. Todesco, P. A. Vaccari, M. Vatasso, *Studi e Testi* 81 (Roma 1938)

Didascalia in English, ed. M. Dunlop Gibson, *Horae Semiticae* II (London 1903)

Didymus the Blind, *Kommentar zum Ecclesiastes*, ed. J. Kramer und B. Krebber, *Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen* 16 (Bonn 1972)

Didymus the Blind, *Psalmenkommentar* III, ed. M. Gronewald, *Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen* 8 (Bonn 1969)

Ephrem Syrus, ed. L. Leloir, *Saint Éphrem, Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant. Texte Syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709)*, *Chester Beatty Monographs* No. 8 (Dublin 1963)

Ephrem Syrus, ed. L. Leloir, *Commentaire de l'Évangile Concordant ou Diatessaron. Traduit du Syriaque et de l'Aménien*, *Sources Chrétiennes* 121 (Paris 1960)

Epiphanius, *Anchoras und Panarion Haer.* 1-36, ed. K. Holl, GCS, *Epiphanius I* (Leipzig 1915); *Panarion Haer.* 34-64, ed. K. Holl, GCS, *Epiphanius II* (Leipzig 1922); *Panarion Haer.* 65-80, ed. K. Holl, *Epiphanius III* (Leipzig 1933)

Eugyppus Abbas Africanus, *Thesaurus ex S. Augustini Operibus*, Migne, PL 62

Eusebius, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, ed. R. Helm, GCS, Eusebius VII (Leipzig 1926)

Eusebius, *Die Kirchengeschichte I-V*, ed. E. Schwartz, GCS, Eusebius II 1 (Leipzig 1903) and VI-X, II 2 (Leipzig 1908)

Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History...in Syriac*, ed. W. Wright and N. McLean (Cambridge 1898)

Eusebius, Περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων..., ed. P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingen 1887², Hildesheim 1966)

Eusebius, *Questions Evangelicae*, Migne, PG 12

Eusebius, *De Theophania* (Greek fragm.), Migne, PG 24

Eusebius, *Die Theophanie* (Syriac), ed. H. Gressmann, GCS, Eusebius III (Leipzig 1904)

Eusebius, *Theophania Syriaca*, ed. Samuel Lee, *Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea on the Theophania or Divine Manifestation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. A Syriac Version. Edited from an Ancient Manuscript recently discovered* (London 1842)

Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, ed. I. A. Heikel, GCS, Eusebius VI (Leipzig 1913)

Evangelia Apocrypha, ed. C. de Tischendorf (Lipsiae 1876)

Gospel Book written at Armagh by Maelbrigte, B. L. Harley 1802

Gospel of Thomas, ed. A. Guillaumont e.a., *The Gospel according to Thomas* (Leiden-London 1959)

Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis, *Historiarum Libri Decem*, ed. W. Giesebricht und K. Buchner, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur Deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters* II (Darmstadt 1905, 1977²)

Haimo Halberstensis, *Commentarium in Isaiam*, Migne, PL 116

Heliand, ed. F. Genzner (Stuttgart 1966)

Hieronymus, *Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum*, ed. P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingen 1887, Hildesheim 1966)

Hieronymus, *de situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum liber*, ed. P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingen 1872, Hildesheim 1966)

Hieronymus, *Epistulae*, ed. I. Hilberg I and II, CSEL 54 and 55 (1910 and 1912)

Hieronymus, *Commentarius in Epistulam ad Ephesios*, Migne, PL 26

Hieronymus, *Commentarii in Prophetas Minores*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL LXXVI (Turnholti 1969) and LXXVIA (Turnholti 1970)

Hieronymus, *Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri tractatus sive homiliae*, ed. G. Morin, *Analecta Maredsolana* III,2 (Maredsoli 1897)

Hieronymus, *Liber de perpetua Virginitate B. Mariae adversus Helvidium*, Migne, PL 23

Hieronymus, *De Viris Illustribus*, ed. C.A. Bernoulli, *Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellen*. II (Freiburg i.B. u. Leipzig 1895, Frankfurt 1968) and *De Viris illustribus graecis*, Migne, PL 23

Hieronymus, *Tractatus de Psalmo CXXXV*, ed. G. Morin, *Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri tractatus sive homiliae*, *Analecta Maredsoli* II,2 (Maredsoli 1897)

Hieronymus, *Commentariorum in Matthaeum Libri IV*, ed. D. Hurst-M. Adriaen, CCSL LXXVII (Turnholti 1969)

Hieronymus, *Commentariorum in Esaiam Libri I-XI*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL LXXIII (Turnholti 1963) and XII-XVIII, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL LXXIII A (Turnholti 1963)

Hieronymus, *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem Libri XIV*, ed. F. Glorie, CCSL LXXV (Turnholti 1964)

Hieronymus, *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*, Migne, PL 23

Historia investigatio evangelium secundum Lucam, München Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6235, fol. 49v-65v

Historia Passionis Domini

Honorius Augustodunensis, *De Haeresibus libellus*, ed. F. Oehler, *Corp. Haer. I. Script. haer. min. Lat.* (Berolini 1856)

Hugo of St. Cher, *in Librum Isaiae* (Venetiis 1732), *in Evangelium secundum Matthaeum* (Venetiis 1732), *in Evangelium secundum Johannem* (Venetiis 1732) and *In Epistolas Pauli* (Venetiis 1732)

Isidorus of Seville, *De Haeresibus Libri*, ed. P. A. C. Vega, *Script. eccl. Hispano-Lat. Veteris Medii Aevi*, Fasc. V (Typis Augustinianis Monasterii Escurialensis 1940)

Infancy Gospels, Latin, ed. M. R. James (Cambridge 1927)

Irish Reference Bible, München, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14277

Jacob a Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, ed. Th. Graesse (Osnabrück 1965, reprint of 1890³)

John Damascene, *De Haeresibus Liber*, Migne, PG 94

Josephus, *Antiquitates*, ed. H. St. J. Thackeray and R. Marcus, *Loeb Classical Library*

Josephus, *de Bello Judaico*, ed. O. Michel u. O. Bauernfeind, Band I-III (Darmstadt 1959-1969)

Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, ed. E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen 1914) 90-265, and *Apologia* 2-77

Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften I, ed. C. Schmidt-W. Till, *GCS* (Berlin 1954)

Lactantius, *Divina Institutio*, Migne, PL 7

Leabhar Breac, ed. R. Atkinson, *The Passion Homilies from Leabhar Breac, Todd Lectures Series* (Royal Academy, Dublin 1887)

Nag Hammadi Library in English translated by Members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (Leiden 1977)

Nicephorus, *Quae Scripturae canonicae*, Migne, PG 100

Nicephorus Callistus, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae Libri I-VII*, Migne, PG 145

Oracula Sibyllinica, ed. A. Kurfess, Sibyllinische Weissagungen, *Tusculum-Bücherei* (1952)

Origenes, *De Principiis*, ed. P. Koetschau, *GCS, Origenes V* (Leipzig 1913)

Origenes, *Der Johanneskommentar*, ed. E. Preuschen, *GCS, Origenes IV* (Leipzig 1903)

Origenes, *Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilie des Lukas-Kommentars*, ed. M. Rauer, *GCS, Origenes IX* (Berlin 1959²)

Origenes, *Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung*, ed. W.A. Bahrens, *GCS, Origenes VI* (Leipzig 1920) and *Origens VII* (Leipzig 1921)

Origenes, *Jeremiähomilien*, ed. E. Klostermann, *GCS, Origenes III* (Leipzig 1901)

Origenes, *Matthäusklärung*, ed. E. Benz-E. Klostermann, *GCS, Origenes X t.1* (Leipzig 1935) and *Origenes XI t.2* (Leipzig 1937)

Origenes, *Matthäusklärung. Die lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum Series*, ed. E. Benz-E. Klostermann (Leipzig 1933)

Origenes, *Buch I-IV gegen Celsus*, ed. P. Koetschau, *GCS, Origenes I* (Leipzig 1899, *Buch V-VIII, Origenes II* (Leipzig 1899)

Origenes, *Contra Celsum*, ed. H. Chadwick (Cambridge etc. 1953)

Origenes, *de Oratione*, ed. P. Koetschau, *GCS, Origenes II* (Leipzig 1899)

Origenes, *Selecta in Psalmos*, Migne, PG 12

Origenes, *Supplementa ad Originis Exegetica, Scholia ad Matthaeum*, Migne, PG 17

Origenes, *Fragmenta in Matthaeum*, ed. E. Benz-E. Klostermann, *GCS, Origenes XII* (Leipzig)

Origenes, *Homiliae in Ezechiel*, Migne, PG 13

Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 654,5-9, ed. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part IV (London 1904) 4

Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matthaeo Libri XII*, ed. Beda Paulus, *CCSL LVIA* (Turnholti 1984)

Paulus, *De Haeresibus Libellus*, ed. F. Oehler, *Corp. Haeres. I, Script. haer. min. Lat.* (Berolini 1856)

Petrus Comestor, *Historia Scholastica in Evangelia*, Migne, PL 198

Des Petrus von Laodicea Erklärung des Matthäusevangelium, ed. G. Heinrici, *Beiträge z. Gesch. u. Erkl. des Neuen Testaments V* (Leipzig 1908)

Petrus de Riga, *Aurora*, Fitzwilliam Museum, Franklin McLean 31

Philip de Side, ed. C. de Boor, *Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierus...aus der Kirchengeschichte des Siedetus, Texte und Untersuchungen V 2* (Leipzig 1888)

Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*, ed. L. Cohn et S. Reiter, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt VI ed. minor* (Berolini 1915)

Plato, *Theaetetus*, ed. H. N. Fowler, *Loeb Class. Library*, Plato VII (Cambridge, Mass. London 1921, 1977)

Prædestinatus, ed. F. Oehler, *Corp. Haeres. I, Script. haer. min. Lat.* (Berolini 1856)

Procopius of Gaza, *in Isaiam*, Migne, PG 87

Ps. Abdias, *Historiae Apostolicae*, ed. J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (Hamburg 1703)

Ps. Chrysostomus, *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*, Migne, PG 56

Ps. Cyprianus, *de Rebaptismate*, ed. G. Rauschen, *Florilegium Patriticum XI* (Bonn 1906)

Ps. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Discourse of Mary Theotokos by Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem*, ed. E.A. Wallis Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (The British Museum, London 1915)

Die Pseudoklementinen, I Homilien, ed. B. Rehm-J. Irmischer-F. Paschke, *GCS* (Berlin 1969) and *II Recognitions*, ed. B. Rehm-F. Paschke, *GCS* (Berlin 1965)

Ptolémée, *Lettre à Flora*, ed. G. Quispel, *Sources Chrétiennes 45* (Paris)

Rabanus Maurus, *Comment. in Matthaeum*, Migne, PL 107

Sedulius Scottus, *Collectanea in omnes B. Pauli Epistolas*, Migne, PL 103

Sedulius Scottus, *Super Evangelium Mathei 1,1-11,1*, ed. B. Löfstedt, *Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus, Aus der Geschichte der Lateinischen Bibel 14* (Freiburg 1989)

The Seventeen Miracles at Christ's Birth. According to the Book of Uí Máine in the Royal Irish Academy fol. 116v, col. b. l.36ff, ed. K. Meyer, *Zeitschr. für Celtische Philologie V* (1905) 24-25, and According to the Yellow Book of Lecan in Trinity College Dublin, p.170, col. a. l.16ff. ed. V. Hull, *The Middle Irish Apocryphal Account of "The Seventeen Miracles at Christ's Birth"*, *Modem Philology XLIII* (1945) 25-39, esp.32-33

Tertullianus, *de Baptismo*, ed. G. Rauschen, *Florilegium Patriticum XI* (Bonnae 1926)

Tertullianus, *adv. Marcionem*, ed. A. Kroymann, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani Opera*, Pars II, *CCSL II* (Turnholti 1954)

Tertullianus, *adv. Judaeos*. ed. A. Kroymann, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani Opera*. Pars II, *CCSL II* (Turnholti 1954)

Tertullianus, *Apologeticum*, ed. E. Dekker, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani Opera*, Pars I, *CCSL I* (Turnholti 1954)

Theodore bar Khonai, *Liber Scholiorum*, p. II, ed. A. Scher, *Corp. Script. Christ. Or.* 69, *Syr. 26* (Louvain 1912)

Theodoret of Cyr, *Compendium haereticorum Fabularum*, Migne, PG 83

Theodoret of Cyr, *in Isaiam*, Migne, PG 81

Victorinus of Pettau, *de Fabricatione Mundi*, ed. I. Hausleiter, *CSEL 49*

Zacharias Chrysopolitanus, *In Unum ex Quatuor*, Migne, PL 186

Literature

E.L. Abel, Who wrote Matthew ?, *NTS* 17 (1971) 138-152

Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu. Pod redakcją Ks. Marka Starowieyskiego. Tom.I: *Evangelie Apokryficzne* (Lublin 1986)

T. Baarda, Luke 22,42-47 and the Emperor Julian as a Witness of the Text of Luke, *Nov. Test.* 30 (1988) 229-295

W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (Leipzig 1905, Darmstadt 1965)

E. Bammel, Rest und Rulé, *Vig. Christ.* 23 (1969) 88-90

O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (Freiburg im Br.I 1913², II 1914², III 1923, IV 1924¹⁻², V 1932)

G. Bardy, Saint Jérôme et l'Évangile selon les Hébreux, *Mélanges de Science Religieuse* III (1946) 5-36

T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1981)

J. B. Bauer, *Sermo Peccati*, Hieronymus und das Nazareneevangelium, *Bibl. Zeitschr.* n.F.4 (1960) 122-126

W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen 1909, Darmstadt 1967)

U. Becker, Jesus und die Ehebrecherin. Untersuchungen zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte von Joh. 7,53-8,3, *Beihefte zur ZNW* 28 (Berlin 1963)

D. A. Bertrand, L'Évangile des Ébionites: une harmonie évangélique antérieure au Diatessaron, *NTS* 36 (1980) 548-563

B. Bischoff, Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter, *Mittelalterische Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart 1966) 205-273 = *Sacris Erudire* 6 (1954) 189-270

M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford 1967³)

F. Blass und A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen 1965¹²)

J. Blinzler, Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu, *Stuttgarter Bibelstudien* 21 (Stuttgart 1967)

M.-É. Boismard, Évangile des Ébionites et le Problème synoptique (Mc 1,2-6 et par.), *Rev. Bibl.* 63 (1966) 321-352

W. Bousset, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis, *FRLANT* 10 (Göttingen 1907)

S. Brock, The Baptist's Diet in Syriac Sources, *Oriens Christianus* 54 (1970) 113-124

S. Brock, A new Testimonium of the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews', *NTS* 18 (1971/2) 220-222

C. Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1951)

R. van den Broek, *Die Bericht des Koptischen Kyrritus von Jerusalem über das Hebräerevangelium* (not yet published)

R. E. Brown, The Gospel according to John I-XII, *The Anchor Bible* (Garden City, New York 1966)

R. Bultmann, *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen 1964⁶)

K. W. Clark, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America* (Chicago 1937)

H. Conzelmann, Geschichte des Urchristentums, *Grundrisse zum N.T.* 5 (Göttingen 1969)

H. Conzelmann, Der erste Brief und die Korinther, *Krit.-Exeget. Komm. über das N.T.* (Göttingen 1969)

W. E. Crumm, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Heidelberg 1977)

O. Cullmann, Ebionitenevangelium, *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* II (1958³) 298

J. D. M. Derrett, Law in the New Testament. The Palm Sunday Colt, *Nov. Test.* 13 (1971) 241-258

M. Dibelius, Der Brief des Jakobus, *Krit.-Exeget. Komm. über das N.T.* (Göttingen 1959¹⁰)

K. P. Donfried, The Setting of Second Clement in early Christianity, *Suppl. to Nov. Test.* XXXVIII (Leiden 1974)

Die heiligen Drei Könige-Darstellung und Verehrung. Katalog zur Ausstellung des Wallraf-Richartz-Museum 1982/3 (Köln 1982)

H. J. W. Drijvers und G. J. Reinink, Taufe und Licht. Tatian, Ebionärevangelium und Thomasakten, *Text and Testimony. Essays in Honour of A. F. J. Klijn* (Kampen 1986)

B. D. Ehrmann, Jesus and the Adulteress, *NTS* 34 (1988) 24-44

M. Erbetta, *Gli Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento. Vangeli* (Marietta 1975)

C. Estin, Les Psautiers de Jérôme à la lumière des traductions juives antérieures, *Collectanea Biblica Latina* 15 (San Girolamo, Roma 1984)

R. Étaix, Fragments inédits de l'Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum, *Revue Bénédictine* 84 (1974) 271-300

A. Feuillet, Le Récit Lucanien de l'"Agonie de Gethsémani" (Lc XXII,39-46), *NTS* (1975/6) 397-417

J. A. Fitzmeyer, The Oxyrhynchus *Logoi* of Jesus and the Coptic Gospel according to Thomas, *Theological Studies* 20 (1959) 505-560

J. A. Fitzmeyer, The Gospel according to Luke (X-XXIV), *The Anchor Bible* (Garden City, New York 1985)

Foerster, s.v. ἐπιστολος, *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T.* II, 587-595

B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas* (New York 1961)

R. M. Grant, Papias in Eusebius' Church History, *Mélanges d'Histoire des Religions offerts à Henri Puech* (Paris 1974) 189-313

R. M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford 1980)

Greeven, s.v. Λητέω etc, *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T.* II, 894-896C

R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* I (Leipzig 1900)

H. Gressmann, Studien zu Eusebius Theophanic, *Texte und Untersuchungen* VIII 3 (Leipzig 1903) Gutbrod, s.v. Ἰεροπλάνη etc., *Theol. Wörterb. z.N.T.* III, 356-394

D. Y. Hadidian, The Meaning of ἐπιστολικός and the Codices Sergii, *NTS* 5 (1958) 75-81

E. Haenchen, Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangelium, *Theol. Bibl. Töpelmann* 6 (Berlin 1961)

Th. Halton, s.v. Hegesippus, *TRE* XIV, 560-562

R. Handmann, Das Hebräer-Evangelium, *Texte und Untersuchungen* V 3 (Leipzig 1888)

A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* I/1 u.2, II/1 u.2 (Leipzig 1893-1904)

A. Harnack, Über einige Worte Jesu, die nicht in den kanonischen Evangelien stehen, *Sitzungsber. der königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin 1903) 170-208

J. R. Harris, *The Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament* (London 1887)

J. R. Harris, *The Gospel of the Twelve Apostles together with the Apocalypse of each of them*. Edited from the Syriac MS with a Translation and Introduction (Cambridge 1900)

E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance of the Septuagint* II (Oxford 1897)

J. Helderman, Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis. *Nag Hammadi Studies* XVIII (Leiden 1984)

E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen/Leipzig 1904); A. Meyer, *Hebräerevangelium* 11-21; A. Meyer, *Ebionitenevangelium (Evangelium der Zwölf Apostel)* 24-26; (Tübingen 1924²); H. Waitz, *Das Matthäusevangelium der Nazarder (Nazarderevangelium)* 17-23; H. Waitz, *Ebionärevangelium oder Evangelium der Zwölf* 39-48; H. Waitz, *Hebräerevangelium* 48-55

E. Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen 1904)

E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* I (Tübingen 1959³); P. Vielhauer, *Judenchristliche Evangelien (Das Nazarderevangelium, Das Ebionärevangelium u. Das Hebräerevangelium)* 75-108

A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums* (Leipzig 1884, 1963)

H. Hirschberg, Simon Bariona and the Ebionites, *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* 61 (1942) 171-191

H. Hoffmann, *Die heiligen Drei Könige* (Bonn 1975)

O. Hofius, Das Koptische Thomasevangelium und die Oxyrhynchus-Papyri Nr. 1,654 und 655, *Evangelische Theologie* 20 (1960) 21-42 and 182-192

M. Hornschuh, *Die Anfänge des Christentums in Ägypten*, Inaugural Diss. Friedrich-Wilhem-Universität (Bonn 1959)

P. W. van der Horst, Seven Months' Children in Jewish and Christian Tradition, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 54 (1978) 346-360

G. E. Howard, Shem-Tob's Hebrew Matthew, *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Division A. The Period of the Bible (Jerusalem 1986) 223-230

G. Howard, *The Gospel of Matthew according to a Primitive Hebrew Text* (Macon, Georgia 1987)

G. Howard, A Primitive Gospel of Matthew and the Tolf doth Yeshu, *NTS* 34 (1988) 60-70

G. Howard, The Gospel of the Ebionites, *ANRW* 25,5 (Berlin/New York 1988) 4034-4053

N. Hyldahl, Hegesippus Hypomnemata, *Studia Theologica* 14 (1960) 70-113

A. Jacoby, *Ein neues Evangelienfragment* (Strassburg 1900)

M. R. James, Notes on Apocrypha, *JTS* 7 (1906) 562-568

M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford 1924, 1968⁹)

Jeremias, s.v. Ἰωνᾶ, *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T.* III, 410

J. Jeremias, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen 1954³)

J. Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (Göttingen 1960)

J. Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte* (Göttingen 1983²)

H. Kehrer, *Die heiligen Drei Könige in Literatur und Kunst* I (Leipzig 1909, Hildesheim/New York 1976)

Kittel, s.v. λόγιον, *Theol. Wörterb. z. N.T.* IV, 140-145

A. F. J. Klijn, The Question of the Rich Young Man in a Jewish-Christian Gospel, *Nov. Test.* 8 (1966) 149-155

A. F. J. Klijn, Jerome's Quotations from a Nazoraean Interpretation of Isaiah, *Judéo-Christianisme, Recherches historiques et théologiques offertes en hommage au Cardinal Jean Daniélou, Rech. de Science Religieuse* 60 (1972) 241-255

A. F. J. Klijn, The Study of Jewish Christianity, *NTS* 20 (1973/4) 419-431

A. F. J. Klijn, Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian and Aramaic Gospel Tradition, *Text and Interpretation. Studies in the New Testament presented to M. Black*, edited by E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge 1979) 169-177

A. F. J. Klijn, Matthew 11,25/Luke 10,21, *New Testament Textual Criticism, its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of B.M. Metzger* (Oxford 1981) 5-14

A. F. J. Klijn, Jérôme, Isaïe 6 et l'Évangile des Nazoréens, *Vig. Christ.* 40 (1986) 245-250

A. F. J. Klijn, Jewish-Christianity in Egypt, *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. by B. A. Pearson and J. E. Goehring (Philadelphia 1986) 161-175

A. F. J. Klijn, Das Hebräer- und das Nazorärevangelium, *ANRW* 25,5 (Berlin-New York 1988) 3997-4033

A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reinink, Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects, *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* XXXVI (Leiden 1973)

E. Klostermann, *Apocrypha II, Evangelien* (Berlin 1929³)

U. H. J. Körtner, Papias von Hierapolis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des frühen Christentums, *FRLANT* 133 (Göttingen 1983)

Clemens Kopp, *Die heiligen Stätten der Evangelien* (Regensburg 1950)

H. J. Kraus, Die Kulttraditionen des Berges Thabor. Eine alttestamentliche Studie. *Basileia. Walter Freytag zum 60. Geburtstag*. Heraugegeben von J. Hermelink und B. J. Margull (Stuttgart 1950, 1961²)

W. G. Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Heidelberg 1963¹²)

J. Kürzinger, Papias von Hierapolis und die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments, *Eichstätter Materialien* 4 (Regensburg 1983)

M.-J. Lagrange, L'Évangile selon les Hébreux, *Revue Biblique* 31 (1922) 161-181 and 321-349

M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Paris 1948⁸)

K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, The Beginnings of Christianity Pt. I : *The Acts of the Apostles* IV (London 1933)

H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (München 1976⁵)

F. Lentzen Deis, Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern, *Frankf. Theol. Stud.* 4 (Frankfurt am Main 1970)

J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London 1888)

R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden* II/2 (Braunschweig 1887)

E. Lohse, Hosanna, *Nov. Test.* 6 (1963) 113-119

R. N. Longenecker, The Christology of early Jewish Christianity, *Studies in Bibl. Theology*, sec. Ser. 17 (London 1970)

M. Lowe and D. Flusser, Evidence corroborating a modified Proto-Matthew Synoptic Theory, *NTS* 29 (1983) 25-47

D. Lührmann, Das Bruchstück ans dem Hebräerevangelium bei Didymus von Alexandrien, *Nov. Test.* 29 (1987) 265-279

D. Lührmann, Die Geschichte von einer Sünderin und andere Apokryphe Jesusüberlieferungen bei Didymus von Alexandrien, *Nov. Test.* 32 (1990) 289-316

M. McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin 1973)

H. Merkel, La Pluralité des Évangiles, *Traditio Christiana* III (Bern etc. 1978)

B. M. Metzger, The Caesarean Text of the Gospels. Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism, *New Testament Tools and Studies* IV (Leiden 1963) 42-72

B. M. Metzger, Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts, *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of R. P. Casey*, edited by J. N. Birsall and R. W. Thomson (Freiburg im Br. 1963) 78-95

B. M. Metzger, *Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament* (London/New York 1971)

B. M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford 1987)

R. Meyer, s.v. κόλπος, *Theol. Wörterb.z.N.T.* III,824-826

W. Michaelis, *Die apokryphen Schriften zum Neuen Testaments* (Bremen 1956, 1958², 1963³)

Michaelis, s.v. μηνί, *Theol. Wörterb.z.N.T.* VI,112-117

U. Monneret de Villard, Le Legende orientali sui Magi Evangelici, *Studi e Testi* 1633 (Città del Vaticano 1952)

E. Moore, BIAZO, APIAZO and Coguates in Josephus, *NTS* 21 (1974/5) 519-543

G. F. Moore, *Judaism* I (Cambridge 1927)

L. Moraldi, *Apocrifi del Nuovo Testamento* I (Torino 1971)

C. Detlef G. Müller, Geschichte der orientalischen Nationalkirchen, *Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte* 2 (Göttingen 1981)

R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom. A Study of early Syriac Tradition* (Cambridge 1975)

F. Mussner, Der Jakobusbrief, *Herders Theol. Kommentar z. N.T.* XIII 1 (Freiburg 1975)

F. Neirynck, *The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark*, J.-M. Sevrin, The New Testament in Early Christianity, *Bibl. Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* LXXVI (Leuven 1989) 123-175

The New Testament in Greek. The Gospel according to St. Luke. Part Two. Chapters 13-24. Edited by the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project (Oxford 1987)

Th. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1898, Darmstadt 1966)

T. Orlandi, Coptic Literature, *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, edited by B. A. Pearson and J. R. Goehring (Philadelphia 1986) 51-81

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, s.v. *Pedilavium* 1039

R. Pesch, Das Markus-Evangelium, *Herders Theol. Kommentar* II 1 (Freiburg 1976)

R. Pesch, Levi-Matthäus (Mc 2,14/Mt 9,9). Ein Beitrag zur Lösung eines alten Problems, *ZNW* 69 (1968) 40-56

D. Plooy, *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron* (Leyden 1923)

D. Plooy, *A further Study of the Liège Diatessaron* (Leyden 1925)

E. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* I (1915)

E. Prenschens, *Antilegomena* (Giessen 1905)

R. A. Pritz, Nazarene Jewish Christianity, *Studia Post-Biblica* 37 (Leiden 1988)

J. Quasten, *Patrology* II (Utrecht/Antwerp 1953)

G. Quispel, L'Évangile selon Thomas, *Vigil. Christ.* 13 (1959) 87-117

B. Reicke, s.v. Matthanja, *Bibl. Hist. Handwörterbuch* II (Göttingen 1964) 1171

G. J. Reinink, Neue Fragmente zum Diatessaronkommentar des Ephraemschüler Aba, *Orient. Lovan. Periodica* 11 (1980) 117-133

A. Resch, *Agrapha, Texte und Untersuchungen* V 4 (Leipzig 1889)

A. Resch, Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien, *Texte und Untersuchungen* X 1 (Leipzig 1893)

J. Reuss, Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 61 (Leipzig 1957)

E. Revillont, Les Apocryphes Coptes, Publié et Traduits I: Les Évangiles des Douze Apôtres et de Saint Barthélemy, *Patrol. Orient.* II (Paris 1907)

C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London 1979)

A. de Santos Otero, *Los Evangelios Apócrifos* (Madrid 1946)

A. Schmidtke, Neue Fragmente zu den jüdenchristlichen Evangelien, *Texte und Untersuchungen* XXXVII 1 (Leipzig 1911)

A. Schmidtke, Zum Hebräerevangelium, *ZNW* 35 (1936) 24-44

R. Schnackenborg, Das Johannes-Evangelium 3, *Herders Theol. Kommentar z. N.T.* (Freiburg 1975)

W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* I (Tübingen 1987⁵): P. Vielhauer u. G. Strecker, *Jüdenchristliche Evangelien* (*Das Nazaräerevangelium, Das Ebionäerevangelium u. Das Hebräerevangelium*) 114-147

H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums* (Tübingen 1949)

H. J. Schoeps, Symmachusstudien. A. Spuren ebionitischer Theologoumena in seiner Übersetzung, *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit* (Tübingen 1950) 82-89

H. J. Schoeps, Review J. Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte* (Gütersloh 1951), *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 72 (1951) 289-291

S. Schulz, *Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich 1972)

E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* II, rev. and ed. by G. Vermes etc. (Edinburgh 1979)

H. Schürmann, *Das Lukas-Evangelium, Herders Theol. Kommentar zum N.T* III (Freiburg 1969)

D. Stiefenhofer, *Die liturgische Fusswaschung am Gründonnerstag in der abendländischen Kirche. Festgabe Alois Knöpfler* (Freiburg 1917) 325-339

H. Strack u. P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München 1926)

G. Strecker, *Das Judentum der Pseudoklementinen, Texte und Untersuchungen* 70 (Berlin 1959)

G. Strecker, Eine Evangelienharmonie bei Justin und Pseudoklemens, *NTS* 24 (1978) 297-316

G. Strecker, *Die Bergpredigt. Ein exegetischer Kommentar* (Göttingen 1984)

A. Strobel, Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17,20f, *ZNW* 40 (1958) 157-196

A. Strobel, Die "Bösen Buben" der syrischen Ostervigil, *Zeitschr. für die Kirchengesch.* 4.F. 69 (1958) 113-114

A. Strobel, Die "Keltische Katechese" des Cod.Vat.Regin. lat 49 über das Hebräerevangelium, *Zeitschr. für die Kirchengesch.* 4.F. 76 (1965) 148

Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, ed. K. Aland (Stuttgart 1963 etc.)

W. Telfer, Was Hegesippus a Jew ?, *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 53 (1960) 143-153

C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Leipzig 1896⁸)

K. Treu, Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments in der UdSSR, *Texte und Untersuchungen* 91 (Berlin 1966)

C. H. Turner, Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ, *JTS* 27 (1936) 113-129

H. Waitz, Das Evangelium der Zwölf Apostel (Ebionitenevangelium), *ZNW* 13 (1912) 338-348 and 14 (1913) 38-64 and 117-132

H. Waitz, Neue Untersuchungen über die sogenannten judenthristlichen Evangelien, *ZNW* 36 (1937) 60-81

P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* (Oxford 1990)

A. J. M. Wedderburn, The Problem of the Denial of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV, *Nov. Test.* 23 (1981) 229-241

J. W. Wenham, Why do you ask me about the Good ? A Study of the Relation between Text and Source Criticism, *NTS* 28 (1982) 116-125

J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims. Before the Crusaders* (Warminster 1977)

A. Wilmart, *Auteurs Spirituels et Textes Dévots du Moyen Age Latin* (Paris 1932)

R. McL. Wilson, Apokryphen II, *TRE* III,316-362

G. Winkler, Ein bedeutsamer Zusammenhang zwischen der Erkenntnis und Ruhe in Mt 11,27-29 und dem Ruhen des Geistes auf Jesus am Jordan. Eine Analyse zur Geist-Christologie in syrischen und armenischen Quellen, *Le Muséon* 96 (1983) 267-326

Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* II/2 (Erlangen/Leipzig 1892, Hildesheim/New York 1975)

G. Zaphiris, *Le Texte de l'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu d'après les Citations des Théologiens grecs du IIe au XVe siècle* (Gemblioux 1970)

SUPPLEMENTS TO VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

1. TERTULLIANUS. *De idololatria*. Critical Text, Translation and Commentary by J.H. Waszink and J.C.M. van Winden. Partly based on a Manuscript left behind by P.G. van der Nat. 1987. ISBN 90 04 08105 4
2. SPRINGER, C.P.E. *The Gospel as Epic in Late Antiquity*. The *Paschale carmen* of Sedulius. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08691 9
3. HOEK, A. VAN DEN. *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis*. An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08756 7
4. NEYMEYR, U. *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert*. Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08773 7
5. HELLEMO, G. *Adventus Domini*. Eschatological Thought in 4th-century Apses and Catecheses. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08836 9
6. RUFIN VON AQUILEIA. *De ieiunio I, II*. Zwei Predigten über das Fasten nach Basileios von Kaisareia. Ausgabe mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen von H. Marti. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08897 0
7. ROUWHORST, G.A.M. *Les hymnes pascales d'Ephrem de Nisibe*. Analyse théologique et recherche sur l'évolution de la fête pascale chrétienne à Nisibe et à Edesse et dans quelques Eglises voisines au quatrième siècle. 2 vols: I, Etude; II, Textes. 1989. ISBN 90 04 08839 3
8. RADICE, R. and D.T. RUNIA. *Philo of Alexandria*. An Annotated Bibliography 1937-1986. In Collaboration with R.A. Bitter, N.G. Cohen, M. Mach, A.P. Runia, D. Satran and D.R. Schwartz. 1988. ISBN 90 04 08986 1
9. GORDON, B. *The Economic Problem in Biblical and Patristic Thought*. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09048 7
10. PROSPER OF AQUITAINE. *De providentia Dei*. Text, Translation and Commentary by M. Marcovich. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09090 8
11. JEFFORD, C.N. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. 1989. ISBN 90 04 09127 0
12. DROBNER, H.R. and KLOCK, CH. *Studien zur Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike*. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09222 6
13. NORRIS, F.W. *Faith Gives Fullness to Reasoning*. The Five Theological Orations of Gregory Nazianzen. Introduction and Commentary by F.W. Norris and Translation by Lionel Wickham and Frederick Williams. 1990. ISBN 90 04 09253 6
14. OORT, J. VAN. *Jerusalem and Babylon*. A Study into Augustine's *City of God* and the Sources of His Doctrine of the Two Cities. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09323 0
15. LARDET, P. *L'apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin*. Un commentaire. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09457 1
16. RISCH, F.X. *Pseudo-Basilius Adversus Eunomium IV-V*. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09558 6
17. KLIJN, A.F.J. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09453 9

